The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXXIV, No. 1 JANUARY, 1951

## CONTENTS

A Translation of the Apostolic Constitution *Munificentissimus Deus* . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1

The Queenship of Mary and America *Francis Cardinal Spellman* 18

Saint Joan of France . *Jean-François Bonnefoy, O.F.M.* 20

The Jewish Road to Rome . *Nicholas H. Rieman, S.J.* 31

Lily of Quito . . . . . . *M. Joseph Costelloe, S.J.* 37

The Lay Vocation . . . *Bernard F. Meyer, M.M.* 41

Apostle of Rome . . . . . . . *Edward J. Griffith* 49

Two Solemn Pontifical Definitions . *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 52

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Vernacular Prayers after Mass . . . . . . . . 62

Public vs. Private Mass . . . . . . . . . . 62

Relics of Our Lady and St. Joseph . . . . . . . 63

The Subdeacon Singing the Epistle . . . . . . . 64

The Deacon and the Subdeacon at the Introit . . . . . 64

*(Contents Continued on Next Page)*

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1951, by The Catholic University of America Press

*(Contents Continued from Previous Page)*

The State's Rights over Private Property . . . . . . 65
Procedure for a Communion Call . . . . . . . . . 65
The Pastor's Right to Give First Communion . . . . . 66
Business Contacts with Divorced Persons . . . . . . 67

ANALECTA . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 68

BOOK REVIEWS

Christ the Saviour, *by Reginald Garrigou-Lagrange* . . . . 74
Apostolate of the Sunday Mass, *by E. P. Messenger* . . . . 76
Iñigo de Loyola, *by Pedro Leturia, S.J.* . . . . . . . 76
Catherine McAuley, the First Sister of Mercy, *by Roland Burke Savage, S.J.* . . . . . . . . . . . 77
Vessel of Clay, *by Leo Trese* . . . . . . . . . . 78
Catholic Library Practice. Vol. II. *Edited by Bro. David Martin, C.S.C.* . . . . . . . . . . . . 79

---

EVERY CATHOLIC EDUCATOR, SCHOOL, and PRIEST
*should subscribe to*
*The Catholic Educational Review*
*Edited under the direction of*
THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA
Department of Education

**SOME RECENT CONTENTS:**

- **Teaching in the Age of Mary** . . . . . . . . . . Sr. Mary Peter, S.S.N.D.
- **Effect of the Dialectic upon our view of Christ as Teacher** . . Rev. S. Raymond
- **Adult Education** . . . . . . . . . . . . Sr. Jerome Keeler, O.S.B.
- **Trait Syndromes in High School Boys** . . . . . . . Rev. F. J. Houlahan
- **Three Hundred Years in The Vineyard** . . . . . . Sr. Mary Regina, S.S.J.
- **Wisdom Derived from a Study of the Life of Christ and the Liturgy** . . . . . . Monsignor W. H. Russell

*Subscription Price:* U. S., Canada and Foreign $3.50
Single Number 40 cents

**Address: THE CATHOLIC EDUCATIONAL REVIEW**
**THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA**
**WASHINGTON 17, D. C.**

# MUNIFICENTISSIMUS DEUS

## THE APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTION
## BY WHICH IS DEFINED THE DOGMA OF FAITH THAT MARY THE VIRGIN MOTHER OF GOD HAS BEEN ASSUMED INTO HEAVENLY GLORY IN BODY AND SOUL

Pius the Bishop
Servant of the Servants of God
for Everlasting Remembrance

THE MOST BOUNTIFUL GOD, who is almighty, the plan of whose providence abides in wisdom and love, tempers, in the secret purpose of His own mind, the sorrows of peoples and of individual men by means of joys that He interposes in their lives from time to time, in such a way that, under different conditions and in different ways, all things may work together unto good for those who love Him.[1]

Now, just like the present age, our pontificate is weighed down by ever so many cares, anxieties, and troubles, by reason of very severe calamities that have taken place and by reason of the fact that many have strayed away from truth and virtue. Nevertheless we are greatly consoled to see that, while the Catholic faith is being professed publicly and vigorously, piety towards the Virgin Mother of God is flourishing and daily growing more fervent, and that almost everywhere on earth it is showing indications of a better and a more holy life. Thus, while the Blessed Virgin is fulfilling in the most affectionate manner her maternal duties on behalf of those redeemed by the blood of Christ, the minds and the hearts of her children are being vigorously aroused to a more assiduous consideration of her prerogatives.

---

[1] Cf. *Rom.* 8:28.

Actually, God, who from all eternity regards Mary with a most favorable and unique affection, has, "when the fulness of time was come,"[2] put the plan of His providence into effect in such a way that all the privileges and prerogatives He had granted to her in His sovereign generosity were to shine forth in her in a kind of perfect harmony. And, although the Church has always recognized this supreme generosity and the perfect harmony of graces and has daily studied them more and more throughout the course of the centuries, still it is in our own age that the privilege of the bodily Assumption into heaven of Mary, the Virgin Mother of God, has certainly stood forth most clearly.

That privilege has shone forth in new radiance since our predecessor of immortal memory, Pius IX, solemnly proclaimed the dogma of the revered Mother of God's Immaculate Conception. These two privileges are most closely bound to one another. Christ overcame sin and death by His own death, and the man who is born again in a heavenly way through Baptism has conquered sin and death through Christ Himself. Yet, according to His general rule, God does not will to grant the full effect of the victory over death to the just until the end of time shall have come. And so it is that the bodies of even the just are corrupted, and that only on the last day will they be joined, each to its own glorious soul.

Now God has willed that the Blessed Virgin Mary should be exempted from this general rule. She, by an entirely unique privilege, completely overcame sin by her Immaculate Conception, and as a result she was not subject to the law of remaining in the corruption of the grave, and she did not have to wait until the end of time for the redemption of her body.

Thus, when it was solemnly proclaimed that Mary, the Virgin Mother of God, was from the very beginning free from the taint of original sin, the minds of the faithful were filled with a stronger hope that the day might soon come when the dogma of the Virgin Mary's bodily Assumption into heaven would also be defined by the Church's supreme teaching authority.

---

[2] *Gal.* 4:4.

Actually it was seen that not only individual Catholics, but also those who could speak for nations or ecclesiastical provinces, and even a considerable number of the Fathers of the Vatican Council, urgently petitioned the Apostolic See to this effect.

During the course of time such postulations and petitions did not decrease but rather grew continually in number and in urgency. In this cause there were pious crusades of prayer. Many outstanding theologians eagerly and zealously carried out investigations on this subject either privately or in public ecclesiastical institutions and in other schools where the sacred disciplines are taught. Marian Congresses, both national and international in scope, have been held in many parts of the Catholic world. These studies and investigations have brought out into even clearer light the fact that the dogma of the Virgin Mary's Assumption into heaven is contained in the deposit of Christian faith entrusted to the Church. They have resulted in many more petitions, begging and urging the Apostolic See that this truth be solemnly defined.

In this pious striving, the faithful have been associated in a wonderful way with their own holy Bishops, who have sent petitions of this kind, truly remarkable in number, to this See of the Blessed Peter. Consequently, when We were elevated to the throne of the supreme pontificate, petitions of this sort had already been addressed by the thousands from every part of the world and from every class of people, from our beloved sons the Cardinals of the Sacred College, the Archbishops and the Bishops, from dioceses and from parishes.

Consequently, while We sent up earnest prayers to God that He might grant to our mind the light of the Holy Ghost to enable us to make a decision on this most serious subject, We issued special orders in which We commanded that, by corporate effort, more advanced inquiries into this matter should be begun and that, in the meantime, all the petitions about the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary into heaven which had been sent to this Apostolic See from the time of Pius IX, our predecessor of happy memory, down to our own days should be gathered together and carefully evaluated.[3]

And, since We were dealing with a matter of such great moment and of such importance, We considered it opportune to ask all our venerable brethren in the episcopate directly and authoritatively that each of them should tell us, in his own words, what he thought. Hence, on May 1, 1946, We gave them our letter "Deiparae Virginis Mariae," a letter in which these words are contained: "Do you, Venerable Brethren, in your outstanding wisdom and prudence, judge that the bodily Assumption of the Blessed Virgin can be proposed and defined as a dogma of faith? Do you, with your clergy and people, desire that it should be?"

But those whom "the Holy Ghost has placed as bishops to rule the Church of God"[4] gave an almost unanimous affirmative response to both these questions. This "outstanding agreement of the Catholic prelates and the faithful,"[5] affirming that the bodily Assumption of God's Mother into heaven can be defined as a dogma of faith, since it shows us the concordant teaching of the Church's ordinary doctrinal authority and the concordant faith of the Christian people which the same doctrinal authority sustains and directs, by itself and in an entirely certain and infallible way manifests this privilege as a truth revealed by God and contained in that divine deposit which Christ has delivered to His Spouse to be guarded faithfully and to be taught infallibly.[6] Certainly this teaching authority of the Church, not by any merely human effort but under the protection of the Spirit of Truth,[7] has carried out the commission entrusted to it, that of preserving the revealed truths pure and entire throughout every age, in such a way that it presents them undefiled, adding nothing to them and taking nothing away from them. For, as the Vatican Council teaches, "the Holy Ghost was not promised to the successors of Peter in such a way that, by His Revelation, they might manifest new doctrine, but so that, by His assistance, they might guard as sacred and might faithfully propose the revelation delivered through the Apostles, or the deposit of faith."[8] Thus, from the universal agreement of the Church's ordinary teaching authority we have a certain and firm proof, demonstrating that the Blessed Virgin Mary's bodily Assumption into heaven—which surely no faculty of the human mind could know by its own natural powers, as far as the heavenly glorification of the virginal body of the revered Mother of God is concerned—is a truth that has been revealed by God and consequently something that must be firmly and faithfully believed by all the children of the Church. For, as the Vatican Council asserts, "all those things are to be believed by divine and Catholic faith which are contained in the written word of God or in tradition, and which are proposed by the Church, either in solemn judgment or in its ordinary and universal teaching office, as divinely revealed truths which must be believed."[9]

---

[3] Cf. Hentrich-Von Moos, *Petitiones de Assumptione corporea B. Virginis Mariae in caelum definienda ad S. Sedem delatae*, 2 volumes (Vatican Polyglot Press, 1942).

[4] *Acts* 20:28.

[5] The Bull *Ineffabilis Deus*, in the *Acta Pii IX*, Pars I, Vol. 1, p. 615.

[6] Cf. The Vatican Council, Constitution *Dei Filius*, c. 4.

[7] Cf. *John* 14:26.

Various testimonies, indications, and signs of this common belief of the Church are evident from remote times down through the course of the centuries; and this same belief becomes more clearly manifest from day to day.

Christ's faithful, through the teaching and the leadership of their pastors, have learned from the sacred books that the Virgin Mary, throughout the course of her earthly pilgrimage, led a life troubled by cares, hardships, and sorrows, and that, moreover, what the holy old man Simeon had foretold actually came to pass, that is, that a terribly sharp sword had pierced her heart as she stood under the cross of her divine Son, our Redeemer. In the same way, it was not difficult for them to affirm that the great Mother of God, like her only begotten Son, had actually passed from this life. But this in no way prevented them from believing and from professing openly that her sacred body had never been subject to the corruption of the tomb, and that the august tabernacle of the Divine Word had never been reduced to dust and ashes. Actually, enlightened by divine grace and moved by affection for her, God's Mother and our own most gentle Mother, they have contemplated in an ever clearer light the wonderful harmony and order of those privileges which the most provident God has lavished upon this revered associate of our Redeemer, privileges which reach such an exalted plane that, except for her, nothing created by God other than the human nature of Jesus Christ has ever reached this level.

---

[8] Vatican Council, Constitution *Pastor aeternus*, c. 4.

[9] *Ibid., Dei Filius*, c. 3.

The innumerable temples which have been dedicated to the Virgin Mary assumed into heaven clearly attest this faith. So do those sacred images, exposed everywhere for the veneration of the faithful, which bring this unique triumph of the Blessed Virgin before the eyes of all men. Moreover, cities, dioceses, and individual regions have been placed under the special patronage and guardianship of the Virgin Mother of God assumed into heaven. In the same way, religious institutes, with the approval of the Church, have been founded and have taken their name from this privilege. Nor can we pass over in silence the fact that in the Rosary of Mary, the recitation of which this Apostolic See so urgently recommends, there is one mystery proposed for pious meditation which, as all know, deals with the Blessed Virgin's Assumption into heaven.

This belief of the sacred pastors and of Christ's faithful is manifested still more universally and splendidly by the fact that, since ancient times, there have been both in the East and in the West solemn liturgical offices commemorating this privilege. The holy Fathers and Doctors of the Church have never failed to draw enlightenment from this fact since, as everyone knows, the sacred liturgy, "because it is the profession, subject to the supreme teaching authority within the Church, of heavenly truths, can supply proofs and testimonies of no small value for deciding any individual point of Christian doctrine."[10]

In the liturgical books which deal with the feast either of the Dormition or of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin there are expressions that agree in testifying that, when the Virgin Mother of God passed from this earthly exile to heaven, what happened to her sacred body was, by the decree of divine providence, in keeping with the dignity of the Mother of the Word Incarnate, and with the other privileges she had been accorded. Thus, to cite an illustrious example, this is set forth in that Sacramentary which Adrian I, our precedessor of immortal memory, sent to the emperor Charlemagne. These words are found in this volume: "Venerable to us, O Lord, is the festivity of this day on which the holy Mother of God suffered temporal death, but still could not be kept down by the bonds of death, who has begotten Thy Son Our Lord incarnate from herself."[11]

---

[10] The encyclical *Mediator Dei* (*Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XXXIX, 541).

What is here indicated in that sobriety characteristic of the Roman liturgy is presented more clearly and completely in other ancient liturgical books. To take one as an example, the Gallican Sacramentary designates this privilege of Mary's as "a sacrament beyond description, all the more worthy of being preached as the Virgin's Assumption is something unique among men." And, in the Byzantine liturgy, not only is the Virgin Mary's bodily Assumption connected, time and time again, with the dignity of the Mother of God, but also with the other privileges, and in particular with the virginal motherhood granted her by a singular decree of God's providence. "God, the King of the universe, has granted thee favors that surpass nature. As He kept thee a virgin in childbirth, thus He has kept thy body incorrupt in the tomb and has glorified it by His divine act of transferring it from the tomb."[12]

The fact that the Apostolic See, which has inherited the function entrusted to the Prince of the Apostles, the function of confirming the brethren in the faith,[13] has by its own authority, made the celebration of this feast ever more solemn, has certainly and effectively moved the attentive minds of the faithful to appreciate always more completely the magnitude of the mystery it commemorates. So it was that the feast of the Assumption was elevated from that rank which it had occupied from the beginning among the other Marian feasts to be classed among the more solemn celebrations of the entire liturgical cycle. And, when our predecessor St. Sergius I prescribed what is known as the litany or the stational procession to be held on the four Marian feasts, he specified, along with the feast of the Nativity, those of the Annunciation, the Purification, and the Dormition of the Virgin Mary.[14] Again, St. Leo IV saw to it that the feast, which was already being celebrated under the title of the Assumption of the Blessed Mother of God, should be observed in even a more solemn way when he ordered a vigil to be held on the day before it and afterwards prescribed prayers on the octave day. When this had been done, he decided to take part himself in the celebration, in the midst of a great multitude of the faithful.[15] Moreover, the fact that a holy fast had been ordered from ancient times for the day prior to the feast is made very evident by what our predecessor St. Nicholas I testifies in treating of the principal fasts which "the Holy Roman Church has observed for a long time, and still observes."[16]

---

[11] *Sacramentarium Gregorianum.*

[12] *Menaei totius anni.*

[13] Cf. *Luke* 22:32.

[14] *Liber Pontificalis.*

[15] *Ibid.*

However, since the liturgy of the Church does not engender the Catholic faith, but rather springs from it, in such a way that the practices of the sacred worship proceed from the faith as the fruit comes from the tree, it follows that the holy Fathers and the great Doctors, in the homilies and sermons they gave the people on this feast day, did not draw their teaching from the feast itself as from a primary source, but rather spoke of this doctrine as something already known and accepted by Christ's faithful. They presented it more clearly. They offered more profound explanations of its meaning and nature, bringing out into sharper light the fact that this feast shows, not only that the dead body of the Blessed Virgin Mary remained incorrupt, but that she gained a triumph out of death, her heavenly glorification after the example of her only begotten Son, Jesus Christ; truths that the liturgical books had frequently touched upon only briefly and in passing.

Thus St. John Damascene, an outstanding herald of this traditional truth, spoke out with powerful eloquence when he compared the bodily Assumption of the revered Mother of God with her other prerogatives and privileges. "It was fitting that she, who had kept her virginity intact in childbirth, should keep her own body free from all corruption even after death. It was fitting that she, who had carried the Creator as a child at her breast, should dwell in the divine tabernacles. It was fitting that the spouse, whom the Father had taken to Himself, should live in the divine mansions. It was fitting that she, who had seen her Son upon the cross and who had thereby received into her heart the sword of sorrow which she had escaped in the act of giving birth to Him, should look upon Him as He sits at the right hand of the Father. It was fitting that God's Mother should possess what belongs to her Son, and that she should be honored by every creature as the Mother and as the Handmaid of God."[17]

These words of St. John Damascene agree perfectly with what others have taught on this same subject. Statements no less clear

[16] *Responsa Nicolai Papae I ad consulta Bulgarorum.*

[17] St. John Damascene, *Encomium in dormitionem Dei Genetricis semperque Virginis Mariae,* Hom. II, n. 14; cf. also *ibid.,* n. 3.

and accurate are to be found in sermons delivered by Fathers of an earlier time or of the same period, particularly on the occasion of this feast. And so, to cite some other examples, St. Germanus of Constantinople considered the fact that the body of Mary, the Virgin Mother of God, was incorrupt and had been taken up into heaven to be in keeping, not only with her divine motherhood, but also with the special holiness of her virginal body. "Thou art she who, as it is written, appearest in beauty, and thy virginal body is all holy, all chaste, entirely the dwelling place of God, so that it is henceforth completely exempt from dissolution into dust. Though still human, it is changed into the heavenly life of incorruptibility, truly living and glorious, undamaged and sharing in perfect life."[18] And another very ancient writer asserts: "As the most glorious Mother of Christ our Saviour and God and the giver of life and immortality has been endowed with life by Him, she has received an eternal incorruptibility of the body together with Him who has raised her up from the tomb and has taken her up to Himself in a way known only to Him."[19]

When this liturgical feast was being celebrated ever more widely and with ever increasing devotion and piety, the Bishops of the Church and its preachers in continually greater numbers considered it their duty openly and clearly to explain the mystery that the feast commemorates, and to explain how it is intimately connected with the other revealed truths.

Among the scholastic theologians there have been many who, wishing to inquire more profoundly into divinely revealed truths and desirous of showing the harmony that exists between what is termed the theological demonstration and the Catholic faith, have always considered it worthy of note that this privilege of the Virgin Mary's Assumption is in wonderful accord with those divine truths given us in Holy Scripture.

When they go on to explain this point, they adduce various proofs to throw light on this privilege of Mary. As the first element of these demonstrations, they insist upon the fact that, out of filial love for His Mother, Jesus Christ has willed that she be assumed into heaven. They base the strength of their proofs on the incomparable dignity of her divine motherhood and of all those prerogatives which follow from it. These include her exalted holiness, entirely surpassing the sanctity of all men and of the angels, the intimate union of Mary with her Son, and the affection of preeminent love which the Son has for His most worthy Mother.

---

[18] St. Germanus of Constantinople, *In Sanctae Dei Genetricis Dormitionem,* Sermo I.

[19] The *Encomium in Dormitionem Sanctissimae Dominae Nostrae Deiparae semperque Virginis Mariae,* attributed to St. Modestus of Jerusalem, n. 14.

Often there are theologians and preachers who, following in the footsteps of the holy Fathers,[20] have been rather free in their use of events and expressions taken from Sacred Scripture to explain their belief in the Assumption. Thus, to mention a few of the texts frequently cited in this fashion, some have employed the words of the Psalmist: "Arise, O Lord, into thy resting place: thou and the ark, which thou hast sanctified";[21] and have looked upon the *Ark of the Covenant,* built of incorruptible wood and placed in the Lord's temple, as a type of the most pure body of the Virgin Mary, preserved and exempted from all the corruption of the tomb and raised up to such glory in heaven. Treating of this subject, they also describe her as the Queen, entering triumphantly into the royal halls of heaven and sitting at the right hand of the divine Redeemer.[22] Likewise they mention the Spouse of the Canticles "that goeth up by the desert, as a pillar of smoke of aromatical spices, or myrrh and frankincense" to be crowned.[23] These are proposed as depicting that heavenly Queen and heavenly Spouse who has been lifted up to the courts of heaven with the divine Bridegroom.

Moreover, the scholastic Doctors have recognized the Assumption of the Virgin Mother of God as something signified, not only in various figures of the Old Testament, but also in that Woman clothed with the Sun, whom John the Apostle contemplated on the island of Patmos.[24] Similarly they have given special attention to these words of the New Testament: "Hail, full of grace, the Lord is with thee, blessed art thou amongst women,"[25] since they saw, in the mystery of the Assumption, the fulfillment of that most perfect grace granted to the Blessed Virgin and the special blessing that countered the curse of Eve.

---

[20] Cf. St. John Damascene, *op. cit.*, Hom. II, n. 11; and also the *Encomium* attributed to St. Modestus.

[21] *Psalm* 131:8.

[22] *Psalm* 44:10, 14 ff.

[23] *Cant.* 3:6; cf. also 4:8; 6:9.

[24] *Apoc.* 12:1 ff.

[25] *Luke* 1:28.

Thus, during the earliest period of scholastic theology, that most pious man, Amadeus, Bishop of Lausanne, held that the Virgin Mary's flesh had remained incorrupt—for it is wrong to believe that her body has seen corruption—because it was really united again to her soul and, together with it, crowned with great glory in the heavenly courts. "For she was filled with grace and blessed among women. She alone merited to conceive the true God of true God, whom, as a virgin, she brought forth, to whom she gave milk, fondling Him upon her breasts, and in all things she waited upon Him with reverent care."[26]

Among the holy writers who at that time employed statements and various images and analogies of Sacred Scripture to illustrate and to confirm the doctrine of the Assumption, which they piously believed, the Evangelical Doctor St. Anthony of Padua holds a special place. On the feast day of the Assumption, while explaining the Prophet's words: "I will glorify the place of my feet,"[27] he stated it as certain that the divine Redeemer had bedecked with supreme glory His most beloved Mother from whom He had received human flesh. He asserts that "you have here a clear statement that the Blessed Virgin has been assumed in her body, which was the place of the Lord's feet. Hence it is that the holy Psalmist writes: 'Arise, O Lord, into thy resting place: thou and the ark which thou hast sanctified.'" And he asserts that, just as Jesus Christ has risen from the death over which He triumphed and has ascended to the right hand of the Father, so likewise the ark of His sanctification "has risen up, since on this day the Virgin Mother has been taken up to her heavenly dwelling."[28]

When, during the middle ages, scholastic theology was especially flourishing, St. Albert the Great who, to establish this teaching, had gathered together many proofs from Sacred Scripture, from the statements of older writers, and finally from the liturgy and from what is known as theological reasoning, concluded in this way: "From these proofs and authorities and from many others, it is manifest that the most blessed Mother of God has been assumed above the choirs of angels. And this we believe in every way to be true."[29] And, in a sermon which he delivered on the sacred day of the Blessed Virgin Mary's Annunciation, explaining the words "Hail, full of grace," words used by the angel who addressed her, the Universal Doctor, comparing the Blessed Virgin with Eve, stated clearly and incisively that she was exempted from the fourfold curse that had been laid upon Eve.[30]

---

[26] Amadeus of Lausanne, *De Beatae Virginis obitu, Assumptione in caelum, exaltatione ad Filii dexteram.*

[27] *Isaias* 61:13.

[28] St. Anthony of Padua, *Sermones dominicales et in solemnitatibus, In Assumptione S. Mariae Virginis sermo.*

Following the footsteps of his distinguished teacher, St. Thomas Aquinas—the Angelic Doctor—despite the fact that he never dealt directly with this question, nevertheless, whenever he touched upon it, always held, together with the Catholic Church, that Mary's body had been assumed into heaven along with her soul.[31]

Together with many others, St. Bonaventure, the Seraphic Doctor, held the same views. He considered it as entirely certain that, as God had preserved the Most Holy Virgin Mary from the violation of her virginal purity and integrity in conceiving and in childbirth, He would never have permitted her body to have been resolved into dust and ashes.[32] Explaining these words of Sacred Scripture: "Who is this that cometh up from the desert, flowing with delights, leaning upon her beloved,"[33] and applying them in a kind of accommodated sense to the Blessed Virgin, he reasons thus: "From this we can see that she is there bodily . . . her blessedness would not have been complete unless she were there as a person. The soul is not a person, but the soul, joined to the body, is a person. It is manifest that she is there in soul and in body. Otherwise she would not possess her complete beatitude."[34]

In the fifteenth century, during a later period of scholastic theology, St. Bernardine of Siena collected and diligently evaluated all that the mediaeval theologians had said and taught on this question. He was not content with setting down the principal considerations which these writers of an earlier day had already expressed, but he added others of his own. The likeness between God's Mother and her divine Son, in the way of the nobility and dignity of body and of soul—a likeness that forbids us to think of the heavenly Queen as being separated from the heavenly King—makes it entirely imperative that Mary "should be only where Christ is."[35] Moreover, it is reasonable and fitting that not only the soul and body of a man, but also the soul and body of a woman should have obtained heavenly glory. Finally, since the Church has never looked for the bodily relics of the Blessed Virgin nor proposed them for the veneration of the people, we have a proof on the order of a sense experience.[36]

---

[29] St. Albert the Great, *Mariale*, q. 132.

[30] St. Albert the Great, *Sermones de Sanctis, sermo XV In Annuntiatione B. Mariae;* cf. also *Mariale*, q. 132.

[31] Cf. St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theol.*, IIIª, q. 27, a. 1; q. 83, a. 5, ad 8; *Expositio salutationis angelicae; In Symb. Apostolorum expositio*, a. 5; *In IV Sent.*, d. 12, q. 1, a. 3, sol. 3; d. 43, q. 1, a. 3, sol. 1, 2.

[32] Cf. St. Bonaventure, *De Nativitate B. Mariae Virginis*, sermo V.

[33] *Cant.* 8:5.

[34] St. Bonaventure, *De Assumptione B. Mariae Virginis*, sermo I.

The above-mentioned teachings of the holy Fathers and of the Doctors have been in common use during more recent times. Gathering together the testimonies of the Christians of earlier days, St. Robert Bellarmine exclaimed: "And who, I ask, could believe that the ark of holiness, the dwelling place of the Word of God, the temple of the Holy Ghost, could be reduced to ruin? My soul is filled with horror at the thought that this virginal flesh which had begotten God, had brought Him into the world, had nourished and carried Him, could have been turned into ashes or given over to be food for worms."[37]

In like manner St. Francis of Sales, after asserting that it is wrong to doubt that Jesus Christ has Himself observed, in the most perfect way, the divine commandment by which children are ordered to honor their parents, asks this question. "What son would not bring his mother back to life and would not bring her into paradise after her death if he could?"[38] And St. Alphonsus writes that "Jesus did not wish to have the body of Mary corrupted after death, since it would have redounded to His own dishonor to have her virginal flesh, from which He Himself had assumed flesh, reduced to dust."[39]

Once the mystery which is commemorated in this feast had been placed in its proper light, there were many teachers who, instead of dealing with the theological reasonings that show why it is fitting and right to believe the bodily Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary into heaven, chose to focus their mind and attention on the faith of the Church itself, which is the Mystical Body of Christ without stain or spot[40] and is called by the Apostle "the pillar and ground of truth."[41] Relying on this common faith, they considered the teaching opposed to the doctrine of Our Lady's Assumption as temerarious, if not heretical. Thus, like many others, St. Peter Canisius, after he had declared that the very word "Assumption" signifies the glorification, not only of the soul but also of the body, and that the Church has venerated and has solemnly celebrated this mystery of Mary's Assumption for many centuries, adds these words of warning: "This teaching has already been accepted for ages, it has been held as certain in the minds of the pious people, and it has been taught to the entire Church in such a way that those who deny that Mary's body has been assumed into heaven are not to be listened to patiently, but are everywhere to be denounced as over-contentious or rash men, and as imbued with a spirit that is heretical rather than Catholic."[42]

---

[35] St. Bernardine of Siena, *In Assumptione B. Mariae Virginis*, sermo II.

[36] *Ibid.*

[37] St. Robert Bellarmine, *Conciones habitae Lovanii*, sermo XL, *De Assumptione B. Mariae Virginis*.

[38] *Oeuvres de St. François de Sales*, the sermon for the feast of the Assumption.

[39] St. Alphonsus Liguori, *The Glories of Mary*, Part 2, d. 1.

At the same time the great Suarez, when he was professing in the field of Mariology the norm that "keeping in mind the standards or propriety, and when there is no contradiction or repugnance on the part of Scripture, the mysteries of grace which God has wrought in the Virgin must be measured, not by the ordinary laws, but by the divine omnipotence."[43] Supported by the common faith of the entire Church on the subject of the mystery of the Assumption, he could conclude that this mystery was to be believed with the same firmness of assent as that given to the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin. Thus he already held that such truths could be defined.

All these proofs and considerations of the holy Fathers and the theologians are based upon the Sacred Writings as their ultimate foundation. These set the revered Mother of God as it were before our very eyes as most intimately joined to her divine Son and as always sharing His lot. Consequently it seems impossible to think of her, the one who conceived Christ, brought Him forth, gave Him milk, held Him in her arms, and fondled Him at her breast, as being apart from Him in body, even though not in soul. Since our Redeemer is the Son of Mary, He could not do otherwise, as the perfect observer of God's law, than to honor, not only His eternal Father, but also His most beloved Mother. And, since it was within His power to grant her this great honor, to preserve her from the corruption of the tomb, we must believe that He really acted in this way.

---

[40] Cf. *Eph.* 5:27.

[41] *I Tim.* 3:15.

[42] St. Peter Canisius, *De Maria Virgine.*

[43] Suarez, *In tertiam partem D. Thomae*, q. 27, a. 2, disp. 3, sec. 5, n. 31.

We must remember especially that, since the second century, the Virgin Mary has been designated by the holy Fathers as the new Eve, who, although subject to the new Adam, is most intimately associated with Him in that struggle against the infernal foe which, as foretold in the protoevangelium,[44] finally resulted in that most complete victory over the sin and death which are always mentioned together in the writings of the Apostle of the Gentiles.[45] Consequently, just as the glorious resurrection of Christ was an essential part and the final sign of this victory, so that struggle which was common to the Blessed Virgin and her divine Son should be brought to a close by the glorification of her virginal body, for the same Apostle says: "when this mortal thing hath put on immortality, then shall come to pass the saying that is written: Death is swallowed up in victory."[46]

Hence the revered Mother of God, from all eternity joined in a hidden way with Jesus Christ in one and the same decree of predestination,[47] immaculate in her conception, a most perfect virgin in her divine motherhood, the noble associate of the divine Redeemer who has won a complete triumph over sin and its consequences, was finally granted, as the supreme culmination of her privileges, that she should be preserved free from the corruption of tomb and that, like her own Son, having overcome death, she might be taken up body and soul to the glory of heaven where, as Queen, she sits in splendor at the right hand of her Son, the immortal King of the ages.[48]

Since the universal Church, within which dwells the Spirit of

---

[44] *Gen.* 3:15.

[45] Cf. *Rom.*, chapters 5 and 6; *I Cor.* 15:21-26, 54-57.

[46] *I Cor.* 15:54.

[47] The Bull *Ineffabilis Deus, loc. cit.*, p. 599.

[48] Cf. *I Tim.* 1:17.

Truth who infallibly directs it towards an ever more perfect knowledge of the revealed truths, has expressed its own belief many times over the course of the centuries, and since the Bishops of the entire world have almost unanimously petitioned that the truth of the bodily Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary into heaven should be defined as a dogma of divine and Catholic faith—this truth which is based on the Sacred Writings, which is thoroughly rooted in the minds of the faithful, which has been approved in ecclesiastical worship from the most remote times, which is completely in harmony with the other revealed truths, and which has been expounded and explained magnificently in the work, the science, and the wisdom of the theologians—We believe that the moment appointed in the plan of divine providence for the solemn proclamation of this outstanding privilege of the Virgin Mary has already arrived.

We, who have placed our pontificate under the special patronage of the most holy Virgin, to whom We have had recourse so often in times of grave trouble, We who have consecrated the entire human race to her Immaculate Heart in public ceremonies, and who have time and time again experienced her powerful protection, are confident that this solemn proclamation and definition of the Assumption will contribute in no small way to the advantage of human society, since it redounds to the glory of the Most Blessed Trinity, to which the Blessed Mother of God was bound by such singular bonds. It is to be hoped that all the faithful will be stirred up to a stronger piety towards their heavenly Mother, and that the souls of all those who glory in the Christian name may be moved by the desire of sharing in the unity of Christ's Mystical Body and of increasing their love for her who in all things shows her motherly heart to the members of this august Body. And so we may hope that those who meditate upon the glorious example Mary offers us may be more and more convinced of the value of a human life entirely devoted to carrying out the heavenly Father's will and to bringing good to others. Thus, while the illusory teachings of materialism and the corruption of morals that follows from these teachings threaten to extinguish the light of virtue and to ruin the lives of men by exciting discord among them, in this magnificent way all may see clearly to what a lofty goal our bodies and souls are destined. Finally it is our hope that belief in Mary's bodily Assumption into heaven will make our belief in our own resurrection stronger and render it more effective.

We rejoice greatly that this solemn event falls, according to the design of God's providence, during this Holy Year, so that we are able, while the great Jubilee is being observed, to adorn the brow of God's Virgin Mother with this new gem, and to leave a monument more enduring than bronze of our own most fervent love for the Mother of God.

For which reason, after we have poured forth prayers of supplication again and again to God, and have called upon the Spirit of Truth, for the glory of Almighty God who has lavished His special affection upon the Virgin Mary, for the honor of her Son, the immortal King of the ages and the Victor over sin and death, for the increase of the glory of that same august Mother, and for the joy and exultation of the entire Church; by the authority of Our Lord Jesus Christ, of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, and by our own authority, We pronounce, declare, and define it to be a divinely revealed dogma: that the Immaculate Mother of God, the ever Virgin Mary, having completed the course of her earthly life, was assumed body and soul into heavenly glory.

Hence if anyone, which God forbid, should dare wilfully to deny or to call into doubt that which We have defined, let him know that he has fallen away completely from the divine and Catholic faith.

In order that this, our definition of the bodily Assumption of the Virgin Mary into heaven may be brought to the attention of the universal Church, we desire that this, our Apostolic Letter, should stand for perpetual remembrance, commanding that written copies of it, or even printed copies, signed by the hand of any public notary and furnished with the seal of a person constituted in ecclesiastical dignity, should, when they are tendered or shown, be accorded by all men the same reception they would give to this present Letter.

No man is permitted to make any alteration in this, our declaration, pronouncement, and definition or, by rash attempt, to oppose and counter it. If any man should presume to make such an attempt, let him know that he will incur the wrath of almighty God and of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul.

Given at Rome, at St. Peter's, in the year of the great Jubilee, 1950, on the first day of the month of November, on the Feast of All Saints, in the twelfth year of our pontificate.

I, PIUS, BISHOP OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH,
HAVE SIGNED, SO DEFINING.

# THE QUEENSHIP OF MARY AND AMERICA

Catholic faith and piety know and love in the Blessed Virgin Mary the dignity of a queen and the tenderness of a mother. Mary, the mother of God, the mother of our Saviour and our mother is the Queen of Heaven, Queen of Martyrs and Queen of Peace. Every Catholic child as soon as he is able to say the words learns to repeat "Hail Holy Queen." To Our Lady of Victory in glory we joyfully chant during Eastertide "Queen of Heaven Rejoice."

A Marian Congress was significantly held in Rome during the week preceding the occasion when the Vicar of Christ solemnly defined the Bodily Assumption of the Mother of Christ. Angels and men may contemplate in vision and in faith the glory of their Queen, the mother of their King.

Mary's queenly quality is her share in the dignity of her Son, Christ, the King. Our Saviour is our King, and our King is our Redeemer. Living in Mary, the House of Gold and Tabernacle of the Most High, Christ is King. Here He began His redemptive giving. This divine dynamism of love was consummated on the cross as the throne of Christ, the King. In the words of the Angelic Doctor: "Christ's priesthood and kingdom were consummated principally in His Passion."[1]

Mary is Queen because she is the mother of the God-Man, Christ our King, Shepherd and Saviour. The union of God and man took place in the holy temple of Mary's virginal womb. Divinity was wrapped in Mary's immaculate flesh. Thus God in a singular manner appropriated His mother to Himself. How true to say that the Blessed Virgin is "gilt with Divinity, not that she is God but because she is the Mother of God." Realizing the most intimate nearness of Christ the King to His mother in His virginal birth, and the ineffable share Mary had in the salvific sufferings of her divine Son on Calvary, we immediately salute her as the Queen-Mother of the Saviour and of men.

The Immaculate Heart of Mary, to whom our beloved reigning pontiff, Pope Pius XII, dedicated the human race, was pierced seven times by swords of sorrow. These were the dolors of our Queen and Mother. The same Holy Father solemnly and infallibly declared the everlasting victory and glory of the Mother of Sorrows in the definition of Our Lady's Bodily Assumption into the unending joy and peace of paradise. What comfort and courage the queenly triumph of their Mother will bring to the broken hearts of enslaved millions in a frightened world!

---

[1] *Sum. theol.*, III, q. 35, a. 7, *ad* 1.

The American writers who were privileged to represent their nation in the world-wide tribute to the Blessed Virgin Mary happily chose to discuss what the Church teaches on Our Lady's queenly prerogatives.

The Catholic Church in the United States is under the special patronage of the Immaculate Mother of God. The Immaculate Conception and the Assumption are two closely related mysteries. The mystery of the Assumption is the keynote of Catholic doctrine on Mary while the mystery of the Immaculate Conception is the foundation of this theological structure. We Americans who belong in a special manner to Our Lady as "The Immaculate Conception" rejoice exceedingly in the new honor we were permitted to give her when the Sovereign Pontiff defined that Mary's Bodily Assumption into Heaven had been revealed by God as a truth to be believed by all men.

In our age of crisis and impending doom wisely do we turn to the woman boldly foretold in the first days of our race and beautifully depicted by Saint John in his ecstatic apocalyptic vision. The Lord God cursed for all time the serpent, and the serpent's pride and power will be conquered by "the woman" and "her seed": "I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and thy seed and her seed: she shall crush thy head, and thou shalt lie in wait for her heel."[2] The serpent that would seduce, poison and paralyze the world once again lies in wait for the woman's heel. We lift our eyes, our minds and our hearts to the Lady, "clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and on her head a crown of twelve stars." By divine decree she will conquer that "great red dragon . . . that old serpent, who is called the devil and Satan, who seduceth the whole world."[3] And we hope to hear in our times through the prayerful power of our Queen and Mother: "a loud voice in heaven, saying: Now is come salvation, and strength, and the kingdom of our God, and the power of His Christ."[4]

Queen of Martyrs! Queen of Glory! Queen of Peace! Pray for us.

✠ FRANCIS CARDINAL SPELLMAN
*Archbishop of New York*

[2] *Gen.* 3:15. [3] *Apoc.* 12:3, 9. [4] *Apoc.* 12:10.

# SAINT JOAN OF FRANCE

Louis XI was undoubtedly a great king, and merits recognition as one of the men who laid the foundations of French unity. Nevertheless, his violent, overbearing character, and the lack of principle in his choice of methods, were the cause of many tragedies. One of these we are about to relate. The heroine of the story is Louis XI's own daughter, Joan of France, known also as Joan of Valois.

## I. CHILDHOOD

The future Louis XI, son of King Charles VII, had not yet attained his majority when he began to emancipate himself from the paternal control, make common cause with the nobles who were in revolt against their king, and set himself up in Dauphiny in a state amounting to independence of his father. At the age of twenty-one he was a childless widower. He remarried seven years later, taking to wife, against his father's wishes, the gentle Charlotte of Savoy. All impatient as he was to govern, he had to wait ten years more for the crown, which he attained in 1461 at the age of thirty-eight years.

One of his first concerns, when he was seated on the throne of France, was to call upon his subjects to unite with him in prayer for the gift from Heaven of an heir to the crown. In the ten years of his second marriage, only three children had been born to him. The two first had died at an early age, and the third, the future Anne de Beaujeu, could not, by the law in France established, be his successor. Once more, on April 23, 1464, Queen Charlotte became a mother, but the King's hopes were dashed. He had got, not the heir he looked for, but another daughter. She received in baptism the name of Jeanne (Joan), in memory of Joan of Arc, who, in the days of her grandfather, had liberated the soil of France.

Poor Joan! labouring under the weight, not only of her exalted rank, but of the crushing burden of being her father's daughter! She was no more than a pawn upon the chess-board of a sire who was "truly terrible, even to his own flesh and blood." When she was only four days old—her father had not even seen her—he planned a marriage for her with the heir-presumptive to the throne, the Duke of Orléans, aged two years! Mark the calculating cunning of the man! Should he have no heir direct, he may still hope to see his grandchildren inherit the succession: if on the other hand, Heaven should grant him a male heir, he will have a double hold upon the rival house, through his daughter in the first place, and in the second, from the fact that her family will have a rank which they will be unable to support, except by the help of his royal bounty.

Kept busy by the unrest among his vassals and the threats of war abroad, Louis saw little of Charlotte of Savoy. The long-awaited heir was born at last, in 1470, and received in baptism the name of Charles. About the same time, the King became aware that his daughter Joan was sickly, not to say deformed. He had her examined by the doctors. On receiving their report, with characteristic promptness he decided to separate the child from her mother and pack her off to the castle of Lignières-en-Berry. Doubtless his intention was to keep the court in ignorance of her physical weakness. Was he at all distressed to learn that his child was deformed? We do not know. But one thing is certain: from this time on he entertained the idea of making use of her infirmity to serve his purpose of extinguishing the house of Orléans. His design is patent in a cynical letter written by him to the Comte de Dammartin, at the time when Joan was ten years old: "My lord Grand Master, I have made up my mind to carry on with the marriage of my little daughter Joan and the little Duke of Orléans, because it seems to me that the children they will have together will not cost them much to rear. I advise you that I mean to accomplish the said marriage, elsewise those who go contrary to me will have no assurance of life in my realm. . . ."

At the same time he sent to Marie of Clèves, the young duke's mother, to inform her of the offer he was making the young duke—the hand of a daughter of France. Open threats, in the case of refusal of son or mother, were conveyed by special envoys: they were evoked by the desperate opposition of both, and of all their house. Whether they liked it or not, they were obliged to put their names to the civil contract, and reckon to do it of their own free will. That was on Oct. 29, 1473.

Puzzled, all the same, by this resistance on the part of the house of Orléans, the king expressed a desire to see his daughter. She was brought to him; and a chronicler tells us that, seeing her for the first time in seven or eight years, he made a large Sign of the Cross, exclaiming "Good God! I had no idea she was so ugly!"

Joan, sick, exiled from the mother who dared not come to see her, even when she knew her to be ill, separated from her elder sister and her brother Charles—Joan knew nothing of the King her father's doings.

She was barely twelve years old when he informed her that he was about to marry her to her cousin the Duke of Orléans, who was fourteen. At fourteen years of age a boy is still a minor, but the young duke, duly advised by his mother, had a perfectly clear understanding of the impasse into which the King's good pleasure had brought him. He was a handsome youth and had, so people said, all the qualities of a king; he lacked only the title.

One can well imagine his instant and uncontrollable sense of repulsion, when first he encountered his bride-to-be. The closely fitting gowns of the period served to emphasize, rather than conceal, the deformity of shoulder and hip: and then, too, she could not be married in a carriage, and her walk revealed a marked limp. If only her face could have redeemed these defects! but without being positively ugly, it was not beautiful. The young duke put up a struggle, with a vehemence excusable at his age, against the violence that was being offered him; but fearing the worst (and not without cause), his advisers prevailed upon him to receive, in silence, the nuptial blessing. The tears he shed during the ceremony and the wedding banquet were indication enough of the moral violence to which he had been subjected.

The same day, by order of the King, the two children were separated, and Joan returned to Linières. Her Calvary had begun: it was to endure twenty-two years. Intelligent and sensitive, she could not fail to be painfully conscious of the violent urge of repulsion which she inspired in the Duke of Orléans, but she was very far from imagining that a ceremony, duly performed by a bishop armed with special faculties from the Pope himself, could be merely an empty pretence. It must undoubtedly have been within her power to grasp the principle of what constituted the validity of a sacrament: but who, among her intimates, would dare to raise the matter? She believed herself to be married. She grew up in that conviction, and time, far from weakening, served only to confirm it. Such conviction, if we are to believe certain of her biographers, was shared by the good people of France.

Better informed and sure of his ground, the Duke of Orléans lived in the opposite conviction. His behaviour bears witness to his belief with a constancy which the historian who studies his facts cannot possibly question. No one can point to a single word or gesture on his part which can be taken as indicating the least, even transient, change of heart in this regard. His pertinacity in adhering to his refusal was to bring upon him most unpleasant consequences, even imprisonment. From sheer vexation or despair he was to plunge into excesses of the most regrettable nature, and into dangerous enterprises. These were to cause Joan as much suffering, nay more, than the rebuffs which she received from him almost every time they met. It follows that the biographer of Joan cannot afford to omit some account of the restless life led by Louis of Orléans throughout the duration of this marriage which, though invalid, conserved the appearances of validity, and was held to be valid by our saint, right up to the time of the official declaration of nullity (1476-98).

### II. JOAN'S MARRIED LIFE

By weight of his authority Louis XI had made the marriage, but he was not letting the matter rest there. One day Marie of Clèves received an imperious order: she was to conduct her son to Linières and there leave him in Joan's company. "Don't speak of her!" the duke exclaimed. "I would rather be dead!" Nevertheless, he was obliged to comply with the King's command. Time and again, then, he would repair to Linières in company with his mother; but he would make a point of turning his back ostentatiously upon the young princess, and of addressing to her no single word.

The "Roi terrible" was quite prepared to resort to stronger measures. In order to crush the resistance of the duke and his mother, he caused one of the councillors of the house of Orléans, the Sire de Brézille, to be put to the torture and confined in a monastery. The King, moreover, commissioned a doctor to spy upon the conjugal relations of the two young people. The duke, now growing up, was becoming more and more conscious of his tragic situation: but proud by nature, far from yielding to the King's demands, he took the bit in his teeth and attempted to distract himself by giving way to his passions. Joan suffered these disorders in silence, trying by sweetness and patience to win the heart of Louis of Orléans, careful not to bring down upon him the wrath of the King her father.

The apoplexy which struck down Louis XI did not relieve the situation, but it allowed the young duke, without the knowledge of the formidable king, to plunge into intrigue. The latter died on Aug. 30, 1483, and Queen Charlotte of Savoy survived him only a few months. Joan, now nineteen, had no protector other than her brother Charles VIII, and her sister Anne de Beaujeu, who was to exercise the regency till Charles should attain his majority. Hers was undoubtedly a master mind: "the least foolish of women," Louis XI would say of her. "As for wise women," he would add, "there aren't any!"

Louis of Orléans had underestimated the prudence and firmness of the Regent. His scheming to win the hand and heritage of Anne of Brittany finally provoked an armed repression. He was made prisoner and confined in the great Tower of Bourges (July, 1488). Joan of France, far from taking satisfaction in this just chastisement and seeing in it a reprisal for the outrages she had suffered at his hands, hastened to the prisoner's side, offering her services (as she had done on a previous occasion when he was ill), demanding even to share his prison with him. She had a cold reception. Regardless of this, she obtained, first an amelioration in the harsh conditions of his imprisonment, and eventually, in May, 1491, after repeated and more and more urgent applications, his liberation.

After his reconciliation with Charles VIII, who had been consecrated at Rheims May 30, 1484, Louis of Orléans comported himself as a loyal subject, avoiding as best he could the question of his marriage with Joan, with regard to which he remained intractable. He was prepared to address her with respect and treat her with honor: no more.

Meanwhile the war with Italy afforded him a welcome diversion. He advanced ahead of the King and with him succeeded in reaching Naples. The story of their difficult retreat and their "furia francese" which, at Fornova, preserved them from disaster, is well known.

During the course of the expedition Louis had written Joan affectionate letters, signed "Your friend"; but his disposition had not altered and this was the occasion of frequent encounters between him and the young king, who reproached him, not without cause, for his profligacy. The difficult situation created by the despotism of Louis XI was prolonged, and put to the torture two hearts, with widely differing results, as so often happens with the trials of this world. Louis rushed on to perdition; Joan grew in sanctity by practising that most difficult of commandments, the forgiving of offences pushed to their utmost limit: to "seventy times seven times."

All unknown, the culminating event was close at hand. It was to prove, under the dispensation of Providence, a moral benefit both to the duke and to the unfortunate princess, but of a kind suited to their respective capacities: with freedom restored to him, Louis of Orléans was to enter once more upon the path of duty, while Joan, reaching the summit of her long Calvary, was to reveal her strength of soul and steadfastness of faith.

### III. THE DECLARATION OF NULLITY

On April 7, 1498, the Duke of Orléans learned, at one and the same time, of the accident which had befallen Charles VIII and of his death. He became King of France, was crowned at Rheims, and made his solemn entry into Paris. Naturally he did not invite Joan to accompany him. Without loss of time he made application to Rome that the forms and ceremonies to which he had submitted with such bad grace in 1476 might now be declared null and without effect. Alexander VI then occupied the See of Peter. A court of enquiry was set up in accordance with the rules of canon law.

As might be expected, Joan found herself almost without advocate. Times had changed since the death of Louis XI; but people still remembered, for it was only a matter of fifteen years since his death, that it was dangerous to oppose the royal will, and that often enough the humble have to suffer for the feuds of the mighty. Counsel was briefed to assist the princess.

One can imagine how painful for Joan of France this action was. Believing firmly in the validity of her marriage, she considered herself Queen, since the Duke of Orléans had become King. The possible loss of the crown of France was not the only issue at stake in this action, nor the sole cause of her suffering. After all her charity and forbearance, she, who loved peace, saw herself compelled to take an active part in discussions which were to agitate the whole of France and the courts of Europe. The miseries of her physical condition, whether obvious or otherwise, would be dragged into the open for the curiosity of the vulgar, regardless of her dignity and her modesty. As she declared in writing, she would willingly have renounced wordly goods and honours, but her conscience obliged her to defend the validity of her marriage.

She gave proof, on this occasion, of the exceptional maturity of judgment which had been remarkable in her from her earliest youth, and of a great strength of soul: but she lost the case. The court, under the presidency of George of Amboise, Bishop of Albi, gave decision to the effect that there had been no marriage in 1476, by reason of the lack of consent on the part of the Duke of Orléans, and that the defence had been unable to establish that consent had been given subsequently. They regarded as an equal impediment to validity, Joan's physical unfitness for marriage.

This famous action, the records of which have been published *in extenso,* has been and still remains the subject of numerous ambiguities. Some of Joan's biographers refer, in unfelicitous terms, to "repudiation" or "annulment of marriage." Certain of them criticize the decision of the court, without having had even a chance to read the records of the case, since these are in Latin, a language which they do not know. Others, well-intentioned, attack it indirectly and perhaps without meaning to question it, when they give St. Joan the title of "Queen of France." She would have had a right to the title if her marriage had been valid: but it was not valid in the beginning and never became so subsequently. In fact it could not become so, and Joan was never Queen of France.

It is a matter for regret that the decision was given by legates acting in the name of Alexander VI, and that its publication should have been followed by the scandalous cavalcade of Caesar Borgia through France. But no informed canonist has ever contested that the form of procedure of the time was not constantly respected, or that the decision was swayed by personal motives. The natural sympathy which we feel for Joan's great misfortune should not blind us to the justice of the decision.

## IV. THE FOUNDRESS

It was a heavy blow for Joan and her health suffered as the result. "For the whole of one year, she was quite numbed, and her pallor was such that it looked as though her countenance were covered with clay." So relates the *Chronique de l'Annonciade.* But no historian, and the fact is worth noting, has ever heard mention of her having pronounced a single word of disrespect against her judges or the reigning Pontiff; yet she could not have been in ignorance of the unedifying conduct of the latter, since Joan was the comforter of Charlotte d'Albret, widow of that sorry gentleman, Caesar Borgia.

Louis XII, on coming to the throne, had spoken these memorable words which do him honour and to which he was faithful: "the King of France does not revenge the injuries received by the Duke of Orléans." He had no cause for rancour against her whom he was to term henceforth his "dear cousin," and we must admit that he treated her generously, conveying to her the duchy of Bourges and its revenues.

The new Duchess of Berry made her solemn entry into the city of Bourges on the Holy Thursday of the year 1499. She was successful in forming a court of good advisers and kindly women. The wise administration of the duchy, the reform of convents, distribution of alms, care and supervision of the sick—all these did not suffice to satisfy the demands of her conscience and her charity. For all her discretion, it was plain that she gave herself up to stern mortification and prolonged vigils.

She entertained the dream of one day founding a monastery, as her mother and sister had done, but she intended to give it a new rule, a rule which would give her nuns a clear direction towards the imitation of the virtues of the Virgin. Her director, Fr. Gilbert Nicholas (afterwards called Gabriel-Maria) impressed upon her that this would amount to the founding of a new order, and that she would encounter insuperable difficulties. Without waiting for the problem to be solved, Fr. Gilbert recruited a dozen young girls from a school at Tours, initiated them in the religious life in a temporary building, and in the end, yielding to the wishes of the good duchess, drew up a new rule which was approved by Pope Alexander VI on Feb. 12, 1502.

Without in any way neglecting the duties of her state, Joan pursued day by day the formation of these children who were to be the foundation of the spiritual temple she designed to raise to the glory of Mary. She caused to be built, in close proximity to her ducal palace, a monastery suited to the life of the cloister, and a church which is in existence today, though unhappily turned to profane uses.

This heroic soul, matured by suffering, drew ever nearer to

God, but the body which it animated suffered painfully as the result of the trials and struggles of her tormented life. The declaration of nullity in particular had affected Joan's already delicate health. Undaunted in spite of all, she combined with a life of harsh asceticism her obligations as duchess and as foundress. The love of her heart, which the King of France had rejected, she now transferred exclusively to the King of Heaven. This transfer of affection is the subject which painters and sculptors have attempted to express when they represent Joan of France receiving the ring of the mystical marriage, supported by St. Catherine of Alexandria.

The total donation of herself to God was sanctioned by her profession, made privately, with pontifical permission, on Pentecost, 1504, in the order which she had just founded. From this day onward she wore under her ducal robes the grey habit and red scapular of the "Order of the Ten Pleasures and Virtues of the Blessed Virgin Mary." Such indeed was the first name given to the new order by the foundress herself. Today its official title is "The Order of the Virgin Mary," but it is better known under the name of "the Order of the Annonciade," a name which would have delighted St. Joan, who, faithful to the traditions of the House of Savoy, had a great devotion to the mystery of the Annunciation.

Her spiritual outlook was profoundly affected by Franciscan influence, notably as regards devotion to the Passion of Our Lord and to His Sacred Heart. The name of Fr. Gilbert Nicholas figures, and rightly, upon a cross drawn by the saint herself; and the *Chronique de l'Annonciade,* written about 1561 by an Annonciade nun, niece to Fr. Gilbert, attributes to him words which make him indisputably a precursor of devotion to the Sacred Heart. The picture of Jean Bouchet which represents Joan of France in adoration before the Sacred Heart was painted on the occasion of the hundredth anniversary of the death of Joan in 1604. It therefore anticipates by sixty-nine years the first apparition of Paray-le-Monial. It was probably inspired by a picture (date and artists unknown) representing Fr. Gilbert Nicholas contemplating the Sacred Heart during the celebration of Mass.

### V. A GLORIOUS DEATH

Joan had barely laid the foundations of her order when she received warning of her approaching end. On Jan. 22, 1504 (1505 new style), as she was returning from a visit to her spiritual daughters, she gave orders for the walling up of the private door which gave access to the monastery, telling them she would never pass that way again. The next day she was obliged to take to her bed, and February 4 of the same year, after having drawn up her will, she received the Last Sacraments, fully conscious, and gave up her soul to God.

In conformity with the order of the King, her obsequies were conducted with great solemnity on Feb. 21, 1505. On that very day, sick people prayed to her, and to her attributed their restoration to health. She was entombed in the conventual church of the monastery she had founded. In 1562 the Huguenots, having seized Bourges, profaned her tomb and burned her body, which they found intact. But their sacrilegious destruction did not arrest either the progress of her work, which at the eve of the French Revolution numbered forty monasteries, or the veneration which the land of her origin has never ceased to pay her, as is attested by her numerous biographers ancient and modern.

She was beatified in 1742. Her cause of canonization was introduced at Rome in 1771, arrested by the French Revolution, taken up again in 1916, and brought to a happy conclusion by the decree *de tuto* of Feb. 13, 1949. She was canonized on Pentecost, 1950. By a happy concurrence of events, the ceremony coincided with the Catholic Action Pilgrimage to Rome, and with the Congress of Sacred Music. She well deserved this double homage: she spent herself without stint in advancing the Reign of Christ, founding, from her own resources, the College of St. Mary at Bourges, for the reception of poor scholars: and it was she who included in her statutes this wise rule: "With regard to the chant, it is my wish that the sisters do not sing the Office at all until they have learned to sing it properly."

To posterity she leaves an example of a rare self-mastery and an unusual force of character. "The patient man is better than the valiant, and he that ruleth his spirit, than he that taketh cities." Above all she leaves an example of entire submission to the Roman Church. Her attitude offers a strong contrast to that of the so-called reformers who, less than twenty years later, were to sow division and discord throughout Christendom. Lover of peace, today she is a patron well chosen for all who are striving to bring harmony into our divided world.

JEAN-FRANCOIS BONNEFOY, O.F.M.

*Villeneuve-sur-Lot*
*Lot-et-Garonne, France*

## FIFTY YEARS AGO

In *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for January, 1901, the brief leading article by Fr. H. T. Henry, of Overbrook, presents a translation of the hymns for the feast of the Circumcision found in some of the special diocesan French breviaries. . . . Fr. V. McNabb, O.P., contributes a lengthy and scholarly article on "St. Thomas and Inspiration," in which he points out particularly the difference between inspiration and revelation. "It is the opinion of St. Thomas that a prophet is not necessarily a hagiograph; nor is a hagiograph necessarily a prophet. Sometimes the two offices are combined, as in St. John, the inspired prophet of the Apocalypse. Sometimes they would seem to be distinct, as in the case of St. Luke." . . . Fr. Anselm Kroll continues his series of articles on "The Support of Sick, Old, and Delinquent Clergymen." He believes that the funds for this charitable purpose should be collected by levies laid on the priests of the diocese, and suggests that bishops legislate to this effect. . . . Fr. Charles Cronin, of the English College in Rome, discusses the opinion proposed by Fr. Billot, S.J., on the causality of the sacraments—a mode known as "intentional causality." . . . Under the heading "A 'Novel' Critique" a writer who calls himself "Casual Observer" deplores the spirit of bigotry found in some modern novels. He cites in particular the story "Lysbeth," by H. Rider Haggard, which had recently appeared in "Pearson's Magazine." . . . in the *Analecta* there is a discussion on the dangers of hypnotism, in which Dr. Robert Morris, of New York, is quoted to the effect that the use of hypnotism in medical practice requires more caution than the administration of chloroform or similar anaesthetics. . . . One of the books reviewed is Fr. Thurston's *The Holy Year of Jubilee*, prepared for the Holy Year of 1900.

F. J. C.

# THE JEWISH ROAD TO ROME

A recent issue of the *Hebrew Union College Quarterly* carried an article by Fr. M. Raphael Simon, O.C.S.O., on "The Bond Between Israel and the Church." Reports from Israel state that a surprising percentage of the immigrants to that new state are Christian in sentiment and at times in belief. There is besides a great demand for Hebrew New Testaments among them. In our own country, biographies of at least three Jewish converts to Catholicism have seen the presses in the last two years.

## JEWISH TREK TO CHRIST

Isolated facts, these? No. They are part of a trend: the modern Jewish trek to Christ. In Hungary, for example, 30,744 Jews were touched with the waters of baptism between 1919 and 1938. In Italy, a Jewish source verifies that 4,000 Jews entered the Church in two years, 1939-40, and the source adds that "the apostates do not recant"—that is, they did not revert to Judaism once the Hitler peril was over. Data from some countries is less full or exact, but ample enough for one to hazard the statement that at least 100,000 Catholics today, possibly far more, are Jewish.

Prominent among these are David Goldstein, indefatigable street preacher; Israel Zolli, formerly Chief Rabbi of Rome; Raissa Maritain, wife of Jacques; and Maurice Schumann, leading French statesman. Included too is a steadily growing influx of scholars and educators, such as Doctors Heinrich Kronstein of Georgetown University, Waldemar Gurian of Notre Dame, Robert Pollock of Fordham, Herbert Ratner of Loyola (Chicago), and Balduin Schwarz of Xavier, to mention only those that come to mind. Add to these the many Jewish writers who, while not making their full submission to Catholicism, yet have grown deeply interested in Christ—men such as Bergson, or Franz Werfel. This phenomenon has so impressed Fr. John M. Oesterreicher, himself a Jewish convert, that he is preparing a book, *Walls are Crumbling*, on this trend among recent Jewish authors.

The title of his coming book can, as a matter of fact, be extended to the Jews in general, for the walls that for centuries have kept so many Jews from Christ and His Church are all crumbled or crumbling. The conversion-or-exile practices of certain Catholic monarchs made their exit with the sixteenth century. The political barrier of Jewish disfranchisement or at most of a second-class citizenship has been utterly demolished by a gradual process beginning with the French Revolution. The airtight residential ghettoes of Eastern Europe are gone, wiped out by four million ghastly murders in Nazi gas-chambers.

From the other side, the heroic aid given by Catholics to thousands of Jews in their wartime fight for survival has forged a link of friendship between Jew and Catholic undreamed of years ago. The widespread crack-up of orthodox Judaism is the crumbling of yet another wall of separation. For if in itself this waning of religious belief and practice is not something to be happy over, still it undoubtedly can pave the way to the knowledge and love of Christ. The phenomenon is general; almost every barrier that has up to now barred the Jew from Christ is fast disappearing.

With all this premised, is it surprising that Charles Journet in *Destinées d'Israel* regards our age as affording an opportunity unprecedented in history? Or that Rita K. O'Neill could write in the December, 1949, *Catholic World,* "It is all too evident that a rich harvest of fruit is rotting on the vines for want of gatherers"? As Journet Kahn says in the August, 1947, issue of *Integrity,* "It cannot be accidental that in our time Christ occupies Jewish thought in a way that He never has before."

In *The Redemption of Israel,* the very theme of which is the return of the Jews to Christ their Messias in the Church, John Frideman even dares to write, "It is our firm conviction and belief that the modern age has seen the passage . . . to the phase of universal salvation [of the Jews]. . . . Our conviction is founded on a reasoned interpretation of the signs of the times. . . ." And he adds, "It is of the profoundest moment to establish the fact that we live in the phase of salvation." Yes, the Jews of 1950 are ripe for a widespread—some would even say for a general—return to Christ. All the signposts point that way.

### AN AMERICAN OPPORTUNITY

Not only are many Jews ready for the great return to Christ. It is we American Catholics who are destined by God to play a large role in that return of His people to the Jew of Jews. No great reflection is needed to grasp this fact. Two sets of questions will make it only too clear. Where do most of the world's Jews live today? Five years ago, Alexander Ginsberg of the New York Bar computed that about 5,300,000 Jews, 48.2% of the world's total, then resided in the United States. Today that figure is certainly 50%. And where in our nation do most of these Jews live? The answer is immediate: in America's large cities.

Now for the companion questions. Where among the nations of the world does the Catholic Church display the most vitality? Without any boasting, with all deep humility in the knowledge that it is God's gift, we yet can say—in the United States. Our 40,000-plus priests, the variety of our Catholic projects and organizations, our far-flung educational system, our great material resources—all these quite amaze European Catholics. And where is the American Catholic Church concentrated? Again the answer is parallel: in our large cities.

Combine those two sets of facts, and America's major role in Jewish conversion is perfectly evident. More than that, with American influence abroad being what it is, the trend among American Jews may determine in no small degree the trend among those abroad. Truly it rests in American Catholic hands whether the world's Jews in large numbers shall find their Messias.

Yet, strange though it be, the American Catholic apostolate to the Jew is unbelievably slight. There is a Catholic Center for Jews in Brooklyn, and a Guild of Our Lady of Sion in Manhattan. Valuable extension activities are carried on by these two groups, but by no means on an adequate scale. In Kansas City, the Sisters of Our Lady of Sion have a high school and convent, and from there direct the Archconfraternity of Prayer for Israel. They publish quarterly the *A.P.I. Bulletin*, which goes out to about 12,000 subscribers, and distribute perhaps 30,000 pieces of literature a year. Lastly, late in 1949 the Fathers of Our Lady of Sion opened in Cincinnati what seems to be their first house in the United States.

That represents, as far as I know, the organized effort we American Catholics are making to grasp the greatest opportunity in history for Jewish acceptance of Christ. Compare that to the fifty Catholic centers working for Jewish conversion among the half of the world's Jews outside our country. Or compare what we are doing with the American Protestant apostolate to the Jews, which already twenty years ago had sixty-seven mission stations among them, and published five different magazines in the field. There can be no doubt that, up till now, we American Catholics have left almost untilled a field rich with promise. Thousands of American Jews are hungering for Christ, if only we will help them see in Him their Messias, and in the Catholic Church the fullness of Judaism.

The Jews, then, are ready for Christ, and the task of introducing them to Him is largely an American one. There yet remains the question: how shall we go about it? I do not here wish to detail all the various means that may be suitable. I only want to stress the first requisite needed in trying to apply any of those means. That requisite is Christliness, a social attitude to the Jews that is really Catholic. To be more specific, the first great step in any Jewish apostolate must be the expurgation from ourselves and from those we influence of every vestige of anti-Semitism, and the substitution in its place of real Christian friendliness. Quite apart from being a barrier that keeps Jews from Christ, anti-Semitism is, of course, a rank social injustice. But here I wish to consider only its effect on conversion. That effect is summed up in one word. It is catastrophic.

### FRIENDSHIP IS THE DOOR

It needs no long array of evidence to establish this point. After all, it is a great law of grace that friendship is the door to grace. Faith comes to men through men, and the response of the unbeliever to his first awareness of Christ largely depends on the character of the instrument through which that awareness comes. If a Jew's acquaintances shun him, consider him undesirable, bar him from their neighborhoods and schools and fraternities and clubs and friendships, it is sheer folly to think they will be occasions of grace for him. In the story of his life, Mike Gold tells how his first introduction to the name of Christ was the epithet "Christ-killer," hurled at him and his boyhood chums by Irish Catholic youngsters armed with stones. Not, on the whole, an introduction calculated to lead him to Christ.

It was not by chance that Rabbi Zolli of Rome became a Catholic, or that one-tenth of Italian Jews were converted during two years of World War II. For not only was anti-Semitism, even of a mild sort, almost unknown among Italians, but the friendship and charity of people and priests, and above all of the popes, was almost overwhelming. When the Nazis drew up their racist doctrine, Pius XI simply inserted a "not" in each of the propositions, and then had them publicized as the true Catholic doctrine. And when Mussolini discharged the Jewish professors from Italian universities, it was the Pope who hired many of them for research at the Vatican. The sequel is proof enough that for the Jews, the door to Christ is Christliness on the part of Catholics.

Jewish converts themselves tell us the same story. They are not slow to condemn the disbelief and the faults of certain of their fellow Jews, but they are at one in their strong denunciation of anti-Semitism. Fr. Oesterreicher says that sweeping statements and lack of clarity in speaking of Jews sometimes "block the way of grace." Paula Ceilson writes in the issue of *Integrity* referred to before, "Except for a handful of people I have never been treated as anything but a Jewish Catholic. I would like to be treated as myself. . . . But people do not really look at you when you are Jewish." And Rachel Maria, in the story of her conversion, dares to describe anti-Semitism as "that two-fold murder of souls, since it kills alike those who are wounded and those who wound." Rosalie M. Levy in her autobiography makes the same general complaint. It is not without some basis in fact that Israel Zangwill, Jewish author, once wrote, "Had Christians handled us with Christliness, there would not have been a single Jew in Europe."

No doubt the apostolate to the Jews in America demands other things. There should be an intellectual center for the movement, of the type mentioned by Fr. Oesterreicher in his *The Apostolate to the Jews* (America Press). There could well be set up in all our large cities centers of the A.P.I., perhaps attached to parishes in the Jewish neighborhoods. A deeper knowledge by Catholics of the Old Testament and how Christ and the Church constitute its perfect fulfillment—this too would be a great help. But none of these is at all so basic and important as real Christian friendliness and understanding.

Truly, a widespread return of the Jews to Christ is possible as never before—has in fact begun. The barriers of the centuries are falling one by one, and Jews in large numbers are coming to know Christ as what He is: the Perfect Jew. In the return of the modern Jew to his long-forgotten Messias, we Catholics of America, because of our special opportunities, have the major role to play. Our greatest need if we would play that role in all its fulness is real Christliness to the Jew. The excision of anti-Semitism in all its forms from every Christian heart is not only a social desideratum. It is the key to this, our great opportunity. Our Christliness is the Jewish door to Christ. Will we open it wide?

NICHOLAS H. RIEMAN, S.J.

*West Baden College*
*West Baden Springs, Indiana*

---

## THE LAW OF FASTING AND ABSTINENCE

You know that during the past few years the ecclesiastical precept of abstinence and of fasting has become very lax, by reason of the seriousness of the condition of a tremendous number of Catholic men, especially of those who work in the mills and factories of the great cities. The observance of the old law was difficult and almost impossible for these people. Hence the temporary change of which we have spoken was made.

Christ's faithful in our time will lack the virtue of their predecessors if now, when many of those evil demons who, as the Divine Teacher tells us, can be overcome only by prayers and fasting, and when spiritual self-abnegation is especially necessary to overcome and to remove so many evils of the moral and social orders, they do not compensate for the relaxation of this ancient and venerable precept by voluntary works of penance consonant with the age in which we live.

—Our Holy Father, Pope Pius XII, in his allocution *Penitus commoto animo*, delivered to the Cardinals and the Bishops who had come to Rome for the solemn definition of the dogma of Our Lady's Assumption on the day after the definition, Nov. 2, 1950.

# LILY OF QUITO

While on earth the saints of the church have manifested such a wide diversity of social status, talent, interests, occupation, and vocation that at first there seems to be no common denominator among them. But if we would draw some line of distinction, it would be fairly safe to say that their lives fall into two separate categories—those who seemingly led a rather ordinary life, not strikingly different from other good Christians, and those who were in the world but who were definitely not of it, whose biographies are filled with well-authenticated miracles, whose prayers rose ceaselessly to heaven, and whose penances not only terrified the demons of their day, but even now are capable of crying alarm to less heroic souls. In God's providence both types are given to us for our example and encouragement—the one to increase our hope that even without extraordinary deeds we may be ambitious for the better things, the other to increase our faith so frequently dulled by the monotony of everyday existence.

Since the spirit of the New World has been largely that of pioneering, we might expect to find in America "practical saints" like St. Vincent de Paul or St. Robert Bellarmine. As a matter of fact, the only two native-born American saints have been mystics of the highest order, spiritually akin to St. Gertrude, St. Catherine of Siena, and St. John of the Cross. Their lives are a wholesome reminder of the fact that in the church there is a place for Mary among the many Marthas.

The first saint to be born in the Americas is, of course, St. Rose of Lima, Peru. She died at the age of thirty-one on Aug. 30, 1617, and was canonized by Clement X in 1671. The second native American saint to be raised to the altars is St. Mary Ann of Jesus, who was born in Quito, Ecuador, on Oct. 31, 1618, and who died in the same city on May 26, 1645. Her canonization on July 9 of last year has brought to a happy conclusion the earnest desires of her countrymen, who have long regarded her as the patron of their country, and who solemnly declared her to be so through a formal act of Congress on Nov. 30, 1946. The honor which has been conferred on St. Mary Ann has also fulfilled the desires of many generations of Jesuits who have promoted the cause of her beatification and canonization, and who have offered her Mass and recited her office each year on the occasion of her feast.

St. Mary Ann was descended from two illustrious families. Her father was Don Jerónimo Flores Zenel de Paredes, a nobleman from Toledo, and her mother, Doña Mariana Granobles. The last of eight children, Mary Ann was left an orphan at an early age. A few months after her birth her father died, and five years later her devout mother passed to her reward. An elder sister who was married to Captain Cosme de Caso took Mary Ann into her home. There with her three nieces slightly older than herself Mary Ann was taught to read, to write, to sing, to play the guitar, to embroider, and the other arts deemed worthy of her rank.

In the sworn depositions taken for her beatification much is recorded of Mary Ann's early and even precocious piety. At an age when most children have barely reached the use of reason she spent long hours in prayer and, as secretly as she could, undertook the practice of very painful penances. Her nieces soon took her for their spiritual guide, but on two occasions Mary Ann's youthful ardor outstripped her prudence. At the age of seven she made plans with two of her nieces for leaving home and becoming hermits. Great was the disappointment when Mary Ann failed to wake up during the night of their scheduled departure. A later expedition to convert the Indians ended when a savage bull barred the way of the missionaries as they attempted to ascend Mt. Pincincia, not far from their home.

Fr. Juan Comaccio, S.J., professor of theology at the Jesuit college in Quito, was so impressed by Mary Ann's spiritual maturity that he allowed her to receive her first Holy Communion at the then early age of eight. From that time on her life was centered about our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament. At first she was allowed to receive Holy Communion on Sundays and the greater feasts. Though she was perfectly obedient to her confessor, it was observed that this permission neither satisfied her earnest desires nor her very needs. The days on which she received Our Lord, Mary Ann was hale and strong and felt no need for other food, but when deprived of this great consolation she was noticeably weak and faint.

After much thought and prayer Fr. Comaccio finally allowed his young penitent to receive communion daily. But for a time this proved a source of trial to both Mary Ann and her confessor.

Other priests of the college, not acquainted with the saintly dispositions of the girl, thought that Fr. Comaccio was acting rashly in granting this rare permission to one so young. Members of the episcopal household began to express surprise. Mary Ann was grieved at seeing her director in such trouble and perplexity, but one day she encouraged him with the words: "My father, we must have confidence in our Lord. His will must be done and not that of man." Her prophecy that his trials would soon be over came true. The bishop of Quito appointed a commission to examine the disputed question. Judgment was passed in favor of the saint—she could receive communion daily, but she should do so at a late Mass when few people were at hand and there would thus be less possibility of scandal to the laity.

Such a soul seemed destined for the cloister. When Mary Ann was twelve years old her guardian, Captain Cosme, thought it would be well to entrust her to the charge of the sisters of the convent of St. Catherine. When through a strange coincidence this proved impossible, he made all the necessary preparations needed for her entrance into the convent of St. Clare. Always obedient, Mary Ann showed no opposition to the proposal, though interiorly she knew that she was not called to be a nun. In speaking with Mary Ann this truth dawned as well on Fr. Comaccio. His advice to Captain Cosme to give up his plan of sending his charge to the convent was well received. God's design for Mary Ann was that she should remain at home, but wholly devoted to a life of retirement, prayer, and penance.

A number of rooms in the house were set apart for her use. For several years she followed exactly the first program outlined for her by Fr. Comaccio. Five hours a day were spent in mental prayer, and the penances which she was permitted to practice were far in excess of those imposed by rule in the most strict religious orders. With the passing of years Mary Ann's desire for prayer and suffering increased, and her final rule of life, which may be found in the process of her beatification, was one of continual contemplation of the things of God and complete abnegation of herself in the practice of well-nigh incredible austerities.

During the course of her life Mary Ann was favored with extraordinary graces. She had knowledge of distant events, foretold the future, and on one occasion raised a poor servant of the household from the dead. For years she lived only on the Bread of Angels which she received each morning in the church attached to the Jesuit college, and weeks passed without her taking as much as a single drop of water. Despite her visions and her ecstacies, her life was not without its time of sorrow. For a long period she felt abandoned by God, for in the course of her trial her regular confessor was suddenly taken from her, and the one she chose in his place was unable to help her. God finally relieved her in a miraculous way. She heard an interior voice saying: "Go to the church of the Jesuits and open your whole interior to the first religious who will enter the church by the door of the chapel of St. Francis Xavier." Mary Ann went with haste to fulfill the command. Her future guide proved to be no learned theologian but a saintly Jesuit brother, Hernando de la Cruz. In her first talk with him peace was restored to her soul. Brother Hernando remained her spiritual director until her death.

In the late winter and spring of 1645 Quito was afflicted with volcanic eruptions, violent earthquakes, and a plague that struck thousands so rapidly that unburied corpses lay rotting in the streets. The general catastrophe proved an opportunity for Mary Ann to show her heroic charity. One day at the end of a public sermon in the church, Mary Ann, yielding to a supernatural inspiration, arose from her place and before the whole congregation offered her own life to God if He would but spare the city. Her prayer was heard. Within a few days she fell ill, and two months later when the pestilence had been lifted from Quito, the good fight of faith was won.

From the blood which had been drained from her veins during the course of her illness a beautiful lily sprang up. She was buried as she had requested in the church of the Society of Jesus where her body is still honored today.

We may all hope that the life of this great saint may become known throughout the New World. If the lives of the saints can increase our faith and hope, the holy life of St. Mary Ann of Jesus can increase our love for Him who has fashioned for Himself such lovely flowers as "The Lily of Quito."

M. Joseph Costelloe, S.J.

*Università Gregoriana*
*Rome, Italy*

# THE LAY VOCATION

Wherever missioners of the Orient gather to discuss their problems, sooner or later comes up the main question of all, the one that dominates and colors the whole mission outlook, and, be it admitted, colors it for many a rather dark grey. This is the question: why is the growth of conversions so much smaller than one would seem justified in expecting, judging from the history of the conversion of Rome and of Europe in the past?

In China, for instance, Catholicism has had an uninterrupted existence of over 300 years, yet can claim less than one per cent of the population. At the end of a similar period in Rome, despite terrible persecutions, the Church had become a dynamic social institution, ready to take up the Christianization and civilization of all Europe.

In considering this problem some have felt that the use of Latin for the liturgy instead of the language of the people has been one of the chief obstacles. Others have held that the Church in the Orient appeared to the people too much Europeanized in general, in philosophical concepts and in the manner of doctrinal presentation, as well as in liturgical language and forms.

The cultural training of the clergy, it is further pointed out, has been almost exclusively on European lines. In the case of the missioners from foreign lands this was to be expected, but the native clergy, too, are often better acquainted with the classics of pagan Greece and Rome than with their own, although the cultures of China and India rank with the Greco-European among the great cultures of the world. As a result, too many of the Catholic clergy are unable to meet laymen on an equal footing at the higher cultural levels.

Another point which has been proposed is that the religious instruction of the people needs to be made more dynamic, to present the faith as a system of values to live by rather than one of burdens and obligations. Too many Christians look upon the faith primarily as a means of saving their souls through more or less carefully fulfilling the obligations of a Christian life. This tends to make it seem an onerous burden instead of an inspiring ideal, as it was meant to be.

The writer mentions these various opinions without attempting to discuss them. He wishes to suggest, however, that a most important factor in the slow progress of the faith in the Orient today is a rather general lack of appreciation of the social significance of the Gospel message. One's faith is lived almost exclusively in its individual aspect. This is a spiritual malaise which affects Christians not only in Asia but in Europe and America as well, so it cannot be attributed to special mission circumstances.

There is a marked lack of enthusiasm for the sharing of the Gospel message with others. Religion is looked upon as individual, personal. We Catholics are mute, tongue-tied about the things of God and the love of Christ, though able to talk for hours on some other subject close to our hearts. Perhaps there is the answer; the things of God and the love of Christ are not so close to our hearts as some other things. And because we have not learned to speak of them we go through life more or less dumb on the one subject that matters.

The reason for this state of affairs goes very deeply. It has a philosophical foundation. Somewhere along the line between the conversion of Europe and modern times we have somewhat lost sight of an essential function of the laity in the Mystical Body. This function was grasped and practically acted upon in the early Church. Every Christian was an apostle.

The laity are fully members of the Mystical Body. Their participation in its functions is therefore essential for the health and development of the Mystical Body, just as that of members of the human body is for its proper development. Yet our literature on the Church has failed to develop the ideas of St. Paul on the Mystical Body in this regard and practically ignored until very recently their function in society as Catholics. The social contribution of Catholics in modern times has been largely professional and neutral.

There is a whole literature yet to be written on the part of the laity in Christ's mission to His Church, "Going, teach all nations." Here is a vital subject for doctorate theses by theological students. What responsibilities have the laity in the apostolate of the Church as laity? What is their part as individuals, as families, as groups, as parishes? In what does the function of the laity in the Mystical Body actually consist, since it is not the same as that of the clergy?

How is the vocation of the laity given? How can they best be trained for their vocation?

This function of the laity is definitely not direct participation in the ecclesiastical function of the clergy. The laity have not the fulness of the priesthood bestowed by Holy Orders. But they do have the share in Christ's priesthood given by Baptism and Confirmation, and these confer on them a specific position with its corresponding function in the Mystical Body. The clergy are not the only other Christs; the laity are also in their own particular way, and they should actively represent Christ to the world on their own level of lay and social life.

The whole mission of the Church came to be left to the comparatively few clergy and religious; the laity felt absolved from it. This attitude has reached the final stage of absurdity when parents leave to the Catholic school or the Sunday school to teach their children the ordinary prayers and the basic truths of religion. What happens then to the faith when some form of totalitarianism closes the Catholic school or even takes away the parish priest, as is happening in so many places in China and Europe today?

We have taken great pains to form a worthy clergy, and that is as it should be, but have they been trained as leaders in the apostolate of the Church, to enlist the cooperation of the laity, as Christ trained the Twelve? The Apostles formed with the laity a closely knit community in which the clergy were called simply "the elders." The charismata bestowed by the Holy Ghost upon the very first converts were the charismata of the apostolate and showed clearly that the laity were to have a definite and active share in the spread of the Gospel.

The Holy Ghost comes today upon the recipient of Confirmation just as fully as He did upon the first Christians. The strong faith that many show today in most difficult circumstances, the strength to face martyrdom, are not these charismata? If our laity are brought again to look upon the Holy Ghost with the same faith as did the early Christians, why should not the charismata appropriate to our time be multiplied?

It would seem that as emphasis was gradually laid more on the official function of the clergyman as priest, pastor and teacher, the place of the laity began to be obscured; it began to seem as if there were a small place in the fully organized Church for lay responsibility. They were always to remain lambs to be fed. A thoughtful young Chinese layman told the writer recently he thought it was due to feudalism, whose Chinese counterpart is "mandarinism."

Whatever may be its cause and development, the fact remains that from lack of having their own defined vocation and appropriate lay organs to provide scope for their initiative and responsibility, the laity have tended to lose interest. Why have men, especially, tended to become careless about their religion? Is it not in accordance with the psychological law that lack of a conscious sharing in responsibility tends to develop a sense of frustration? To blame it all on secularism is too facile to be true, for the secularism of today cannot compare with that of Rome when invaded by the Christian message.

Who engaged in pastoral work is not concerned about our youth, brimming with vitality, eager for action, studying and planning for their future in society, yet seeming as a class to grow less and less interested in the Christian life? They plan to be doctors, sociologists, engineers; they are preparing for places of responsibility and initiative in government, in business, in education, but what future of responsibility and initiative in the Church is held out to them except for the rare few who join the ranks of the clergy and religious?

Is it any wonder that religion seems to them divorced from life, from the lay life to which they are called in society? Religion does not appeal to them as vital, but rather as something depending on personal preference, just as some prefer one kind of reading and some another. The Christian life, to appeal to the modern mind, must be presented as something to do, as a vocation to build society into the Kingdom of Heaven upon earth. Its practical, actual side must be stressed. Nor is this being false to the Christian spirit. The average man, to save his soul, needs a Christian social structure.

Communists have developed strongly this sense of vocation. Each one is made to feel that he has a definite responsibility in the movement, for instance, on the lowest level it is to influence five other persons among his acquaintances, where he works, etc. He may even take a less attractive position in order to carry out his purpose. He must report to and be responsible to a group of his own equals in the movement as to what he has done. A Communist writer has said that the Church lost her hold on so many because of the lack of vocation among Catholics, and that when Communism ceased to advance it would begin to decay.

In Rome the Church could show a marvelous growth in the face of the most severe persecution, because the laity were in the habit of carrying their share of apostolic responsibility. The faith was then truly a leaven. It passed from one person to another directly, as the leaven passes from one grain of flour to the other. Today we are not a leaven because we do not share the faith with those with whom we are in contact. Yet the conversion of China, the re-Christianization of Europe and America will be morally and mathematically impossible except on the leaven principle.

It is essential always to recall that the Christian life is a corporate one. Everyone shares in the life of all and the life of each. The health and vigor of each individual member and of the whole Mystical Body is the intimate concern and responsibility of every member. If any member be a lame hand or foot, a sodden brain, a low mind, a selfish heart in the Mystical Body, every other member suffers; Christ suffers. Each time one does something only because it is "not wrong" the Mystical Body and the whole human race are hindered in their proper development upon earth and hence will be less happy for all eternity.

It is the renewed recognition of the corporate life of the Mystical Body that has brought about the restoration of corporate liturgical worship and a better appreciation of the Mass as a community sacrifice. Yet such things as participation through congregational singing, dialogue Mass, etc., could conceivably represent a merely temporary and superficial corporateness, unless flowing out into a sense and practice of community that extends itself to other activities of life as well as formal worship. The Mass and the Communion table must not be the only occasions when God's children are together as a family.

Cardinal Suhard of Paris says in his famous pastoral, "Growth or Decline," "Where the religious vitality in a society is in retreat, religious life takes refuge in acts of worship alone. On the other hand, when it is making progress, it diffuses itself from the acts of worship through all the activities of the Christian, even the most profane in appearance." It is a false principle to place the emphasis of religious practice upon self-sanctification to the neglect of social sanctification.

From the beginning of His public career our Lord devoted great care to the formation of His community and the development of its spirit. He led His followers in setting up a way of life that He wished to characterize them before the world. "By this shall all men know that you are My disciples, that you have love one for another." We may not think it advisable to pool our material resources as did so many of the first Christians of Jerusalem, but we must go back to the early Church to learn the true "mystique" of the Mystical Body, that practice of mutual love in community which made the pagans exclaim, "See how these Christians love one another."

It will be to the everlasting glory of Pope Pius XI that, "not without a certain divine inspiration," as he said, he pointed out the lay vocation in the Church, defined in their broad lines its character and necessity, and outlined its field of action. "Catholic Action is the participation of the laity in the hierarchical apostolate of the Church." "That is to say," he explained at another time, "their cooperation in the extension and consolidation of the reign of Christ-the-King in individuals, in families and in the whole of society."

The key of the Pope's concept of the nature of Catholic Action as the lay vocation is found in the principle, "a profound one, often superficially understood," as Cardinal Suhard remarks, "the apostolate of like to like." "The apostles of the workers will be workers; the apostles of the seamen will be seamen; the apostles of the students will be students," the Holy Father kept insisting again and again.

The principle of the apostolate of like to like means to work through the natural social institutions and situations—the family, a friendship, one's work and play, not only to influence others, but to transform these institutions according to the ideal of Christ. It is not limited to a special apostolate like visiting the homes of a district, hospitals and the like, or welfare work, though it will often include these. Its specific aim is to Christianize the whole of society.

Its distinguishing character is found in its being the complete and natural social apostolate, working in and through all the contacts of daily life, in the factory, the office, the market, the school, as well as the home and the neighborhood. Wherever a Catholic may be there is the field of his apostolate, even in a prison or an internment camp. Hence Pius XI said that every Catholic could and should engage in Catholic Action; this apostolate is inherent in the social implications of the Christian life. No one can be "too busy" to make Christ known to the contacts of his daily life.

From this it is clear why Pius XI distinguished Catholic Action from those apostolic associations of the laity which he called "auxiliaries of Catholic Action," that devote themselves to more or less specialized purposes. Once Catholic Action has been mandated by the bishop it becomes the official lay apostolate of the Mystical Body, having the same universal purpose as the Chursh and sharing under the bishop the same divine mission, the conversion of the world. "The liturgy is the Church at worship; Catholic Action is the Church at work in human society."

Catholic Action will not become a reality, however, through the mere giving of conferences or the spread of literature among the laity. It is a life to be lived, which one learns by doing. In order to become such an apostle he must be shown how, he must undergo an apprenticeship in the apostleship with others. The apprenticeship is the work of the priest, as Pius XI kept insisting. It was thus our Lord trained the Twelve. He Himself was engaged in the ministry; they worked with Him, and their training consisted largely in discussion of points brought up by actual situations.

The priest has ready to his hand in the Gospels the model for a program of Catholic Action training. Christ had Apostles and Disciples, so will the chaplain of Catholic Action have militants and general members, distinguished largely by the degree to which they give themselves to the apostolate. The former will be small groups carefully chosen, like the Twelve. They will meet often, youth every week and adults at least fortnightly, to develop an esprit de corps and to be formed in the apostolate by discussion together of the Gospel and of the situations that arise in their daily lives. Each one will assume definite tasks on which he will report at the next meeting. Finally, they will need special spiritual training to give them courage and purity of motive.

Since the purpose of Catholic Action is the Christianization of society, its emphasis will be upon the message to be given, the life to be shared. In making reports at meetings each one will tell how he has tried to influence his own individual surroundings—at home, at work, at recreation. This is the apostolate of like to like and is an essential part of the apostolic formation of members.

Group works should be chosen carefully, such that will not demand too great an expenditure of time and energy in proportion to the social results achieved, and should be placed as far as possible in the hands of general members. As for apostles, "It is not reason that we should leave the word of God and serve tables."

Again and again one sees the energies of Catholic organizations more or less monopolized by recreational or other external activities, so that no time is left to sit down quietly in groups to evaluate the work that is being done and purify their own motives. How often the Great Missioner said to the little band He was forming, "come apart and rest awhile," so that together they might do just these things.

Gradually they began to see what was His method. He sent them out two by two into all the towns and villages to make contact with as many people as possible. They did not simply pass by, dropping the message like leaflets from a plane. They would remain for some time in a village; they would come back again; they would see the same people often frequently afterwards.

They radiated happiness, contentment. People wondered what these men had which they lacked. So it was easy to interest them in the life of the little community, which served God in mutual love. It was this personal work of Christ and the Apostles and disciples which gave background and meaning to the crowds which came to Him and to the miracles. Without it there would have been no infant Church when He ascended into heaven. There were little Christian communities scattered about Jerusalem and Galilee needing only the confirmation of the Holy Ghost to spring into life.

The basic manual of the lay apostolate should be the Gospels. In spite of the change in times and customs, His method is still the one to follow, because it is based on the unchanging nature of man. At every meeting of lay apostles a short passage of the Gospel should be studied, not for its exegesis, but to see how the spirit, the love, the tenderness of Christ can be applied today by the other Christs who share His priesthood by Baptism and Confirmation. And how often the one who shares it more fully by Holy Orders himself finds, too, that new vistas of his priesthood open out to him.

BERNARD F. MEYER, M.M.

# APOSTLE OF ROME

St. Philip Neri arrived in Rome at the age of eighteen, when the capital of Christendom was not only in the worst stages of moral corruption but when the city itself was still bearing many marks of the pillage it had suffered from the hands of the Imperial troops in the year 1527. For some eighteen years St. Philip lived a quiet and humble life as a layman. The great but unobtrusive work which he did for God during this period of his life makes him one of the forerunners and patrons of what we now call Catholic Action. Without going into details, such as his introduction into Rome of the then new devotion of the Forty Hours, it can be said that by his very life he was amongst the pioneers of the idea—as old as Christendom, but obscured during the later Middle Ages— that spiritual life and sanctity are not the privilege of the clergy and religious but the vocation of everybody. "Be ye therefore perfect as your Heavenly Father is perfect," was addressed to all men. St. Philip, as a layman, tried to be perfect.

Have I by using the word "perfect" given some impression that St. Philip was a bit too good to be "good company"? Have you already an idea that he was a little sanctimonious? Nothing could be farther from the truth. He possessed in an altogether unusual degree that elusive, indefinable quality which we call charm. Being a Florentine, this charm had to have humor as one of its main ingredients. There was, if we may believe his contemporaries—and they ought to have known—something altogether magnetic about him. This should make him one of the favorite saints of those of us who, after associating with "good" people so often find ourselves murmuring that well-known prayer, "O God, please make the nice people good—and the good people nice."

At the age of thirty-six, St. Philip was ordained to the priesthood, following the advice of his confessor. One consideration made him overcome his reluctance to accept the honor of ordination: the thought that if he were a priest it would be easier for him to make confession and Holy Communion more available to the people. In his day it was most unusual for the lay people to go very many times in the year to confession, and frequent Communion was almost unknown. St. Philip in his promotion of the practice of frequent Communion was centuries ahead of his day—as he was, indeed, in so many other ways.

As a priest, St. Philip now stayed at home a great deal more than he had done as a layman. The reason was that more and more people wanted to see and talk with him. Virtually all Rome came to be numbered among his penitents. Cardinals, beggars, priests, boys—all classes and sections of the people placed themselves readily under his gentle and joyful guidance.

Among his immediate following were a certain number who felt called to the priesthood and wanted to share in St. Philip's own apostolate. St. Philip's very last idea was to wish to appear as the founder of anything. His great desire—but one that God denied him—was to be unknown. No bushel would have been large enough to have obscured his light. Whether he liked it or not, he found himself the head of a family of priests, whose only idea was to share in his type of apostolate: to preach simple discourses in contrast to the bombastic "eloquence" common in his day, to be available always to those who wished to go to confession, to lead men on by gentle persuasion rather than by terrifying sermons to a life of closer and closer union with Our Lord. As Cardinal Newman, the greatest Oratorian of modern times, has said, "This is the Saint of gentleness and kindness."

By the time that St. Philip came to die in 1590, all Rome, from the Pope downward, revered him as a saint. Only a few years were to elapse before his canonization, and from henceforth he was acclaimed as Rome's second Apostle. He certainly deserves the title, for he, far more than any other one man, brought that city back to the fervent practice of the Catholic faith.

Rome did not forget its Apostle after his death. In the first place, St. Philip's sons remained among the people to perpetuate his memory and his mission. The great new church (known from that day to this as "Chiesa Nuova"), where St. Philip's body still lies, has always been among the most frequented churches in the Eternal City. Countless generations of Romans and of pilgrims have sought and found inspiration and help by praying before the body of the Saint in the little gem of a side-chapel dedicated to him. Of the many people who owe their spiritual formation to St. Philip and his sons, the Oratorians, special mention must be made of the present Holy Father. As a boy he was under the spiritual care of the Fathers of the Oratory. When, after his ordination, Fr.

Eugenio Pacelli wished to do some pastoral work, in addition to the administrative and diplomatic work which was his principal task, it was in the Chiesa Nuova and with the co-operation of the Fathers of the Oratory that he exercised his ministry, more especially, like St. Philip himself, in the confessional. Small wonder that St. Philip and his family, the Oratory, have a particular place in the affections of the present Holy Father.

No one should omit a visit to Santa Maria in Vallicella, more commonly known as the Chiesa Nuova, on a pilgrimage to Rome. It is easy to find, being on the road which leads to the bridge over the Tiber, used by most of those going to St. Peter's. Anyone will be delighted to direct the pilgrim to the Church built by Rome's second Apostle. Once a person has entered the Church and prayed at St. Philip's tomb, he should ask one of the Oratorians to show him St. Philip's room, where there are lovingly preserved his bed, his confessional and a large number of his personal possessions.

EDWARD J. GRIFFITH

*The Oratory*
*Rock Hill, South Carolina*

### THE HOLY FATHER ON PEOPLES AND IDEOLOGIES

We know how to distinguish a straight line from one that is not straight. We know how to make a distinction between peoples and ideologies which are forced upon them, even though these ideologies bring with them ruin in the temporal and the eternal order. And, although we have rejected and condemned certain ideologies, we have never acted against any people or any nation as such. We have only protested against erroneous opinions which try to take away from the world itself the very notion of the Creator, which attempt to wipe out the Christian faith, and which employ the power of political factions for the realization of this impious ideal. We have never spoken or acted other than as the consciousness of the duty which has been assigned to us has demanded.

—Pope Pius XII, in the allocution *Penitus commoto animo*, delivered in the Vatican Hall of Benedictions on Nov. 2, 1950.

# TWO SOLEMN PONTIFICAL DEFINITIONS

The issuance by the Holy Father, on November 1 of last year, of the Apostolic Constitution *Munificentissimus Deus* was by all means the most solemn and the most important doctrinal pronouncement of the Catholic Church during the first half of the twentieth century. This document solemnly defined the dogma of Our Lady's bodily Assumption into heavenly glory just as, ninety-six years previously, the dogma of her Immaculate Conception had been solemnly proclaimed in the Apostolic Letter *Ineffabilis Deus,* issued by Pope Pius IX. The *Munificentissimus Deus* laid special stress upon the intimacy of the connection that exists between the two dogmas. By reason of this close association of the dogmas themselves, and because they form, as it were a class apart among all the pronouncements of the ecclesiastical *magisterium,* the two documents in which these dogmas have been solemnly proclaimed and defined deserve to be compared.

Although their significance is ultimately the same, there is an interesting difference in the terminology employed in the definitions of the Immaculate Conception and of the Assumption. Pope Pius IX wrote that "We declare, pronounce, and define that the doctrine which holds that the most Blessed Virgin Mary, in the first instant of her Conception was, by the special grace and privilege of Almighty God, in view of the merits of Jesus Christ, the Saviour of the human race, preserved free from every taint of original sin, has been revealed by God and must therefore be believed firmly and constantly by all the faithful." The present Holy Father, however, preferred to use the term "dogma," instead of the general definition of dogma employed by his great predecessor. The *Munificentissimus Deus* reads that "We pronounce, declare, and define it to be a divinely revealed dogma that the Immaculate Mother of God, the ever-Virgin Mary, having completed the course of her earthly life, was assumed body and soul into heavenly glory."

The wording of the present Holy Father's definition is much closer to that of the Vatican Council's solemn declaration of papal infallibility in the Constitution *Pastor aeternus* than it is to the terminology of the *Ineffabilis.* The *Pastor aeternus* employed the form of statement proper to those sessions of an oecumenical council at which the Sovereign Pontiff himself presides. Consequently its dogmatic constitutions speak in the name of the Pope himself, *sacro approbante concilio.*

Thus, in the case of the solemn proclamation of papal infallibility, the text of the *Pastor aeternus* reads that "with the sacred Council approving, We teach and define it to be a divinely revealed dogma: that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra* . . . is, through the divine assistance promised to him in Blessed Peter, endowed with that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer wished His Church to be equipped in defining doctrine on faith or morals . . ."

This change in terminology definitely shows the effect of the great advance in the field of sacred theology during the years that elapsed between the issnance of the *Ineffabilis Deus* and the twentieth oecumenical Council. In 1870 the Vatican Council, in pointing out the exact object of divine and Catholic Faith, gave the definitive basic definition of a dogma. According to the Council, "all of those things are to be believed with divine and Catholic faith which are contained in the written word of God or in divine tradition, and which are proposed by the Church, either in solemn judgment or in its ordinary and universal teaching office, as divinely revealed truths which must be believed." In making use of the term "dogma," the Council itself, and now Pope Pius XII, thus inserted into their very definitions a sharp reminder of the fact that the doctrines they were proclaiming had formed a part of the original deposit of faith, were to be found in the sources of revelation, and had been taught by the Church, in at least an implicit fashion, from the very outset. All of this, of course, is involved in the terminology employed by Pope Pius IX, but it does not stand out in the *Ineffabilis* with the clarity it enjoys in the more recent documents.

An even more interesting change is to be found in the warning which, in both the *Ineffabilis* and the *Munificentissimus,* follows immediately after the formula of definition itself. We read in the letter of Pope Pius IX:

> For which reason, if any persons, which God forbid, should presume to think in their hearts otherwise than as We have defined, let them know, and moreover let them realize, that they are condemned by their own judgment, that they have suffered shipwreck with reference to the

> faith, and that they have broken loose from the unity of the Church, and that furthermore, if they should dare openly to signify, orally, or in writing, or in any other outward manner what they think in their hearts, they render themselves by that very fact subject to the penalties prescribed by law.

The terminology of the *Munificentissimus* is significantly different. These are the words of the present Holy Father.

> Therefore if anyone, which God forbid, should dare wilfully to deny or to call into doubt what We have defined, let him know that he has separated himself entirely from the divine and Catholic faith.

The somewhat complicated formula used by Pope Pius IX distinguished between an inward or secret rejection of the defined teaching and the outward or manifest expression of such an attitude. Three aspects of the inward or secret rejection are noted. First, the man who refuses to accept the dogma of Our Lady's Immaculate Conception is designated as thereby "condemned by his own judgment." He is, in other words, guilty of sin against God, and that sin consists in his own intellectual act of judgment. Second, he is said to have "suffered shipwreck with reference to the faith," or, with obvious reference to St. Paul's expression in his First Epistle to Timothy, to have lost virtue of faith. In using this expression the *Ineffabilis* made it clear that the offense involved in rejecting the teaching of the Immaculate Conception was that of heresy itself, a sin which destroys the theological virtue of faith.

Finally, the man who inwardly rejects the dogma of the Immaculate Conception is described, in the *Ineffabilis*, as having "broken loose from *(defecisse ab)* the unity of the Church." The fact that the *Munificentissimus* did not employ this terminology mirrors one of the most interesting aspects of theological history during the past century.

During the past hundred years there has been a movement, sometimes quite powerful, on the part of some Catholic writers, to introduce into Catholic doctrine something like the old and thoroughly discredited Protestant thesis of the invisible Church. Despite the clear and oft-repeated teaching of the Church's *magisterium* to the effect that the true kingdom of God on earth in the New Testament, the ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ in this world, is a genuinely visible society, the group, in fact, which is designated and indicated in the Bellarminian definition of the Church, these individuals under one pretext or another have sought to convince their fellow Catholics that there is a kind of association or group on earth which deserves the title of God's company or city even more than the visible Catholic Church deserves it. One of the key theses of this group was the assertion or the implication that a man becomes a member of this invisible Church by means of his own inward and secret acts. The invisible Church, as a matter of fact, was supposed to be made up of those who actually possess the three theological virtues.

Such a view manifestly involves the corollary that a man may leave the true Church or lose his membership in it through a merely internal or spiritual act. Some who favored this teaching professed to see a confirmation of their view in the pronouncement by Pope Pius IX that a man who rejected the dogma defined in the *Ineffabilis* without giving any outward expression of such rejection had thereby broken off from the unity of the Church.

In point of fact, the statement by Pius IX contained no such implication. It is, and since the sixteenth century it has been, a commonplace of Catholic theology that there are two distinct bonds of union within the true and visible Church of Jesus Christ, two groups of factors which tend to join men with Our Lord in His kingdom on earth. One of these, commonly called the outward bond of unity, is made up of the visible profession of the Catholic faith, the communication in the Sacraments, and submission to legitimate ecclesiastical authority, ultimately to the one visible head of the Church militant, the Vicar of Christ, the Roman Pontiff. The other, the inward or spiritual bond of union, comprises faith, hope, charity, and the rest of the supernatural organism of divine grace.

Since the middle of the seventeenth century, it has been the common teaching of scholastic theology that this first group of factors, the so-called outward or bodily bond of unity, is the one which constitutes a man precisely as a member of the true Church. No one would or could deny that the internal bond is actually a force for the unity of the Church militant. All were agreed that these divine gifts belonged in and to the true Church. At the same time, however, they realized that a man does not become and remain a member of the Church through the possession of all or any of these gifts, but rather through the possession of the outward or bodily bond of unity.

Thus, when Pius IX stated in the text of the *Ineffabilis* that a man who had secretly denied the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, and thereby lost the virtue of faith, without, however withdrawing his public baptismal profession of that same faith, had "broken off from the unity of the Church," he was merely enunciating a truth which referred to a well-known part of the theological teaching about the true Church. Through the destruction of faith in the sin of heresy, a man actually broke from the Church's unity in the very real and true sense that he utterly destroyed the internal bond of ecclesiastical unity within himself. Through his rejection of the divine teaching set forth in the pontifical definition, he had deprived himself of the very good which membership in the Church is meant to give and to foster.

By his decision not to use the formula employed in the *Ineffabilis,* the present gloriously reigning Holy Father showed that he intended to take away every possibility of misunderstanding on this all-important question. By stating that a refusal to believe the doctrine defined in the *Munificentissimus* involved a falling away from the divine and Catholic faith, the Sovereign Pontiff merely reiterated the truth that this teaching is actually a dogma of the faith, and that a refusal to accept it with the assent of divine faith constitutes the sin of heresy. There was no need to say anything about the profession or expression of heresy, since all of this is amply taken care of in the *Codex iuris canonici.*

Although the admonitions about the doctrine differ in the two documents, the *Munificentissumus* repeats exactly the words of the *Ineffabilis* that warn against tampering with the text of the pontifical decree. And, except for the wording of the doctrine defined and except for the introductory word, it also repeats the paragraph of the *Ineffabilis* with reference to authentic copies of the original document.

The two pontifical pronouncements differ both in their classification and in their signature. The *Ineffabilis* is listed as an Apostolic Letter. It ends with the signature, "Pius PP. IX." The *Munificentissimus,* on the other hand, is an Apostolic Constitution, ending with the formula, "Ego PIUS, Catholicae Ecclesiae Episcopus, ita definiendo subscripsi." These last two words are habitually employed by Conciliar Fathers, by men with a definitive vote in ecclesiastical councils. It is to be noted that this type of signature is in no way limited to oecumenical councils. The Fathers of the Provincial and Plenary Councils of Baltimore, for example, used the formula "definiens subscripsi."

The expression "Catholicae Ecclesiae Episcopus" is used by the Holy Father to designate the truly episcopal power which, by divine authority, he exercises immediately over the entire Church militant of the New Testament, and over each member of it. Every member of the Church's hierarchy of jurisdiction, in his capacity as one of the successors of the apostles, is the bishop or head of one of the fully formed local Churches within God's kingdom on earth. The Bishop of Rome, because he is the successor of St. Peter, exercises his episcopal power, not only over the members of his own local Church, but over the other bishops and all of the faithful within the entire Church militant. The words "Bishop of the Catholic Church," in the signature to the *Munificentissimus Deus,* refer to this truly episcopal, immediate, and universal power of the Sovereign Pontiff.

There is little difference in the immediate preambles to the dogmatic definitions contained in the two documents. Both preambles note that the Sovereign Pontiffs prayed fervently for divine guidance before deciding to issue their solemn pronouncements. The formula employed in the *Ineffabilis,* however, is somewhat more complex than that used in the more recent document. Adverting to the purpose of the definitions, the *Ineffabilis* states that Pope Pius IX acted for "the glory of the holy and undivided Trinity, the honor and the ornament of the Virgin Mother of God, the exaltation of the Catholic faith, and the increase of the Christian religion." The formula of the *Munificentissimus,* on the other hand, takes explicit cognizance of the "joy and exaltation of the entire Church," and thus rounds out the basic theme of this Apostolic Constitution, the truth that God tempers the sorrows of this life by the joys that He introduces from time to time in the midst of these sorrows, and the fact that this proclamation of Our Lady's ineffably great prerogative is a source of genuine joy to the entire Church of God.

Each of the two Sovereign Pontiffs who issued these solemn dogmatic definitions announced that he was acting "by the authority of Our Lord Jesus Christ, of the Blessed Apostles Peter and

Paul" and by his own authority. Each, likewise, took advantage of the occasion to note that the issuance of the definition gave him an intense personal satisfaction, since it afforded him the opportunity of working most effectively for Our Lady's honor.

Both the *Ineffabilis* and the *Munificentissimus* mention the good effects which their authors hoped the definitions would bring about. Pope Pius IX was convinced that his definition of Our Lady's Immaculate Conception would, through Mary's intercession, bring it about that "Our Holy Mother the Catholic Church may flourish daily more and more throughout all nations and countries, and may reign from sea to sea unto the ends of the earth, and may enjoy all peace, tranquillity, and liberty; that the sinner may obtain pardon, the sick may be restored to health, the weak may obtain strength of heart, and the afflicted obtain consolation; and that all who are in error, their blindness having been overcome, may return to the path of truth and righteousness and may become one flock and one shepherd."

There is profound theological reasoning behind the present Holy Father's statement of the good effects which he hopes will follow from the definition of Our Lady's Assumption. Pope Pius XII professes himself confident "that this solemn proclamation and definition of the Assumption will contribute in no small way to the advantage of human society, since it redounds to the glory of the Most Blessed Trinity, to which the Blessed Mother of God was devoted by such singular ties."

In this pronouncement the Holy Father focussed the minds of men on the all-too-frequently overlooked ultimate purpose of the created universe and of all the activity of created things. In the welter of anxieties and arguments on subjects of immediately practical import, the world, and sometimes perhaps the children of the Church itself, have tended to forget the serenely immutable and essential truth that things and acts are good for the human race only when they contribute to the glory of the Holy and Undivided Divine Trinity. The definition of the Assumption is described as sovereignly beneficial to the children of men primarily because of the fact that is actually ordered to the glory of the Triune God. Next to the definition itself, this is perhaps the most important statement in the entire text of the *Munificentissimus Deus*.

The recent Apostolic Constitution is not content with pointing out the ultimate reason why the definition of Our Lady's glorious

Assumption will always have been a good thing for mankind. It goes on to enumerate certain definite benefits in the spiritual order which we may expect to follow from this solemn act of the Church's highest doctrinal authority.

First among these hoped-for benefits is an increase in love for and devotion to Our Lady on the part of Catholics themselves. The Holy Father's description of the next advantage stresses the intimate union of Mary with the true and visible Catholic Church, the Mystical Body of her divine Son. The Holy Father hopes that "all those who glory in the Christian name may be moved by the desire of sharing in the unity of Christ's Mystical Body and of increasing their love for her who in all things shows her motherly heart to the members of this August Body."

Primarily, of course, this statement shows that the Holy Father wishes to have this solemn definition influence persons who call themselves Christians, but who are unhappily not members of the one true Church, to desire the real intimacy of union with Christ and with His Blessed Mother that can only be found through membership in the Catholic Church. It also gives evidence of the Holy Father's desire that Catholics themselves should learn to appreciate and to love the Church ever more and more, precisely because it is the family within which alone we find the fellowship of Our Lord and of Mary.

The next individual benefit the Holy Father seeks and expects from the definition of Our Lady's Assumption actually constituted one of the strongest motives that influenced him to write his recent great encyclical letter, the *Humani generis*. It is the desire of Pope Pius XII that "those who meditate upon the glorious example Mary has given may be more and more convinced of the value of a human life entirely devoted to carrying out the heavenly Father's will and bringing good to others."

Those who come to realize and appreciate this truth will inevitably recognize the error and inanity of materialism, one of the systems of thought most potent for evil in our own day. The rejection of materialism, consequent upon a genuine grasp of the divinely revealed truth of the Assumption, must necessarily bring with it an evaluation of and a contempt for the doctrinal and moral vagaries that materialism brings in its train. This defeat of materialism is rendered final and conclusive in the soul of a man who utilizes the teaching on Our Lady's Assumption to strengthen his own belief in the dogma of our own final resurrection.

Both the *Ineffabilis* and the *Munificentissimus* carry rather extensive reasons or explanations of the dogmatic definitions incorporated into them. A comparison of these two documents provides a certain insight into the progress of sacred theology during the past century.

In general, the elements of the explanation are much the same in both documents. Both the *Ineffabilis* and the *Munificentissimus* appeal to the ancient and constant teaching of the Church on the subject of their definitions. Both indicate that the traditions with which they are concerned manifested themselves in the teaching of the Roman Church and of the Bishops, and that they are expressed in the liturgy and the pious practice of God's kingdom on earth. Both also mention the investigations ordered by the Sovereign Pontiffs as preliminaries to the definitions, and both speak of letters to the Catholic episcopate throughout the world to ascertain their attitude and belief, as well as the attitude and the belief of their flocks, on these questions.

There are, however, certain definite and important modifications introduced into the *Munificentissimus*. This Apostolic Constitution, after a general introduction, begins by connecting contemporary interest in the doctrine of the Assumption and the excellence of recent studies on this subject with the definition of the Immaculate Conception. It stresses the many petitions made to the Holy See for the solemn definition of this dogma, particularly since the Vatican Council. It refers here to the magnificent work of the Jesuit Fathers Hentrich and Von Moos, a study actually ordered by the Holy Father himself. And, in this connection, it incorporates into its text a magnificent and tremendously important study of the Church's ordinary and universal *magisterium*.

The *Ineffabilis* was issued sixteen years prior to the dogmatic constitutions of the Vatican Council. Hence it was addressed to a public still somewhat confused by Gallicanism, a heresy which was not solemnly condemned until the issuance of the Vatican Council's Constitution *Pastor aeternus*. As a result, the *Ineffabilis* had to insist very strongly on the function and the importance of the Holy See as a teacher of divinely revealed truth. Hence by far the greatest stress is placed on this authority of the Roman Church in the document defining Our Lady's Immaculate Conception.

No such constraint existed when the *Munificentissimus* was written. On the contrary, the point most strongly urged in this Constitution is precisely that of the universal consent of the *ecclesia docens*. And, just as the magnificent development of the section of theology dealing with the infallible *magisterium* of the Roman Pontiff stemmed in great measure from the teaching contained in the *Ineffabilis*, so we may confidently expect that under the impetus of *Munificentissimus* the next few years will see a comparable advance in that section of sacred doctrine that treats of the functioning of the Church's ordinary and universal *magisterium*.

Outside of certain verses of Sacred Scripture, the only direct quotations in the *Ineffabilis* are those from a letter of Pope Alexander VII. The *Munificentissimus*, on the other hand, cites liberally from various liturgical books and from the writings of Fathers, Doctors, and scholastic theologians of the Church. This procedure manifests the tremendous progress in positive theology during the past century. Thus, while the *Ineffabilis* contents itself with resuming the theological reasonings and arguments which had been employed in teaching the truth of Our Lady's Immaculate Conception, and ascribing them in a general way to the theologians as a group, the *Munificentissimus* shows these theological processes as they actually appeared on the pages written by the leaders of Catholic thought throughout the centuries.

Both of these documents are most important for the study of sacred theology. There is no doubt that the issuance of the *Munificentissimus* will result in an increased study of the older Apostolic Letter by Catholic theologians. The interesting, if superficial, differences of approach will themselves be instructive to all those who apply themselves to the study of these two documents. The points of similarity are even more enlightening. The two documents will inevitably serve as a basis for a hitherto undreamed of advance in that section of sacred theology which deals with the activity of the Church's divinely commissioned and infallible *magisterium*. Thus, in this way also, they will be of service to the Church Our Lady loves.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

*The Catholic University of America*
*Washington, D. C.*

# Answers to Questions

## VERNACULAR PRAYERS AFTER MASS

*Question:* What about the custom of reciting three Our Fathers and three Hail Marys at the end of High Masses, either in black or in the color of the day, for the deceased for whom the Mass has just been offered? I read somewhere that prayers in the vernacular were forbidden at the end of a funeral Mass. Does this apply to an ordinary daily sung Mass?

*Answer:* The custom of adding such prayers as are spoken of by our correspondent to a Mass offered for the repose of the soul of a deceased person reminds us of lighting a candle to illuminate a room already flooded with sunlight. Such supplementary prayers seem to indicate a lack of appreciation of the supreme value of the Holy Sacrifice, which has just been offered for the intention for which the prayers are recited.

As to legislation of the Congregation of Sacred Rites concerning prayers in the vernacular after Mass, we can recall only decree 3805, which permits the recitation of the "Blessed be God" or indulgenced prayers for the faithful departed after the usual Leonine prayers at the end of Low Mass. We see no objection to the common practice of adding prayers in English after all the ritual prayers at a funeral have been recited.

## PUBLIC VS. PRIVATE MASS

*Question:* What is a public Mass and what is a private Mass? If three Masses are celebrated daily at the high altar in a parish church, are all these to be considered public, or private, Masses? When the Ordo directs that certain commemorations are to be made only in private Masses, just which Masses are meant?

*Answer:* The distinction between public and private Masses is one which has received very sparse treatment in manuals of liturgy. In answer to the question proposed, let us say that Masses are distinguished, *ratione solemnitatis extrinsecae,* into Solemn Masses (including Pontifical Masses), High Masses, and Low Masses. The Low Mass is a private Mass, except in the instances to be mentioned later. This form of Mass is called private either because it is celebrated by a priest without the assistance of sacred ministers and without the chant of the Church or, according to some, because only the celebrant receives Holy Communion. This latter distinction does not hold, because a Low Mass may remain a *Missa privata* even though some of the faithful receive Holy Communion at it.

In addition, however, to the lack of external solemnity in a Low Mass, consideration must be given to the obligation governing its celebration to determine whether or not it is to be classed as a *Missa privata.* Thus, capitular Masses said where there are chapters of canons, conventual Masses in monastic chapels, and the parochial Masses on Sundays and other days are to be regarded as public, not private, Masses, even though they are celebrated as Low Masses.

In general, we may say that Low Masses, with the exceptions noted in the last paragraph, are to be regulated by the directions as to commemorations etc. as *Missae privatae.* Masses *in cantu,* whether Solemn or High, and the special Low Masses referred to above are to be classed as public Masses.

## RELICS OF OUR LADY AND ST. JOSEPH

*Question:* An elderly nun recently presented me with a reliquary purporting to contain bits of the veil of the Blessed Virgin and of the cloak of St. Joseph. The paper of authentification was signed by the Bishop of Assisi, Oct. 1, 1932. Is there such a thing as authentic relics of Our Lady and St. Joseph?

*Answer:* We must distinguish between first and second class relics of Our Lady and St. Joseph. No actual remains of the body of the Blessed Virgin can be authentic, since her Assumption into heaven is a dogma of Faith. First class relics of St. Joseph have never officially been exhibited as genuine. Portions of the garments of Our Lady or of St. Joseph, as well as articles possessed or used by them, might possibly still be extant. The only question about them is that which concerns their authenticity. A celebrated relic of Our Lady, which is claimed to have been a portion of her veil, has long been venerated in Chartres. Tradition says that it was the gift of Charlemagne. Similar relics of St. Joseph are probably preserved and venerated.

## THE SUBDEACON SINGING THE EPISTLE

*Question:* The subdeacon ordinarily faces the altar for the singing of the Epistle. Is there any authority for him to turn towards the congregation to do so?

*Answer:* The subdeacon, for the singing of the Epistle at Solemn Mass, conformably to the directions of the *Ritus servandus* of the Missal (VI, 4), stands at the epistle side, facing the altar. At a Pontifical Mass, or a Solemn Mass *coram episcopo,* he turns towards the bishop seated at the throne. For the singing of the Epistle, he may use a lectern, which is placed before him just before the Epistle and removed immediately after it. This is the custom followed in the Roman basilicas. The only instance, in our knowledge, of the subdeacon facing the congregation for the singing of the Epistle would be when it is chanted from an ambo, or pulpit, which is still legitimate, *ubi ita consuetum est,* according to the *Caeremoniale episcoporum* (II, viii, 40).

## THE DEACON AND SUBDEACON AT THE INTROIT

*Question:* In some places, at Solemn Mass, the deacon and subdeacon stand at the Epistle corner for the Introit, the former on the second step and the latter on the floor of the sanctuary, so as to form a kind of semi-circle with the celebrant. Elsewhere, one sees the deacon and subdeacon standing one behind the other and both behind the celebrant. Is either position a matter of law or is one free to follow the custom of the place? Moreover, should there be any difference when the Mass is a Requiem one?

*Answer:* There is a definite prescription of the rubrics of the Missal (*Ritus serv.,* IV, 7) directing that when the celebrant recites the Introit and the *Kyrie,* the deacon should stand at his right and the subdeacon at the right of the deacon. Hence the arrangement of *unus post alium* behind the celebrant is incorrect. Martinucci (Lib. I, Cap. xii, 19) would have the celebrant, deacon, and subdeacon arrange themselves to form a kind of semi-circle at this time. Most authors follow him, v.g. Fortescue, p. 112; Baldeschi, III, v; Baltimore *Ceremonial,* III, ii, 5. The Missal gives no indication that any different order of arrangement of celebrant and ministers is to be observed at a Mass of Requiem, when there has been no incensation of altar and celebrant at the Introit.

William J. Lallou

## THE STATE'S RIGHTS OVER PRIVATE PROPERTY

*Question:* Theologians tell us that if a person has damaged another's property without any formal guilt—and consequently without any obligation to make restitution, as far as the natural law is concerned—he will nevertheless be bound in strict justice to compensation if the civil authority commands him to do so (*post sententiam judicis*). Now, by what authority may the civil authority command a person to renounce a portion of his private property when he is not obliged to do so by the law of God?

*Answer:* It is an accepted principle of Catholic theology that in certain circumstances, for the sake of the common good, the State possesses the authority to dispose of the property of the citizens. This authoritative disposition of the State then binds the citizen in conscience, even though the natural law of itself imposes no such obligation. A concrete example would be this: Without any subjective guilt a man drives his car through his neighbor's hedge, causing considerable damage. By the natural law he is bound to no restitution because formal guilt was not present. However, if the neighbor takes the case to court—as he is perfectly entitled to do—and is accorded a certain amount of compensation, he obtains a right to this in commutative justice. Certainly, the common good demands that the State possess such a right; for, if a person whose property has been damaged could collect compensation only when the offender acknowledged subjective guilt, many acts of injustice would be perpetrated, and widespread indifference toward the property of others would prevail. It is to be noted that the principle here invoked by no means implies that the State possesses arbitrary power over the property of the citizens. It is only in certain specified cases, when otherwise the welfare of society would certainly be gravely impaired, that the civil authority is empowered to supersede the individual's right to retain his private property.

## PROCEDURE FOR A COMMUNION CALL

*Question:* In our country it seems to be the general custom for priests to open the tabernacle and take out the Blessed Sacrament for communion calls, while dressed in their street clothes. Is this permissible?

*Answer:* The priest should be vested in cassock, surplice and stole when he places the Blessed Sacrament in the pyx in preparation for a communion call. Or, this could be done in the course of the Mass, after the communion. As is very evident, in a case of urgent necessity, the priest could do this while wearing his civil garb. But, supposing that the sacred Host is in the pyx, reposing in the tabernacle, what is the procedure to be followed when the priest is ready to bring the Blessed Sacrament to the sick person? According to Schulze (*Manual of Pastoral Theology* [St. Louis, 1929], 274), the priest should be vested in cassock, surplice and stole when he removes the Blessed Sacrament from the tabernacle and hangs the burse around his neck, and should then go to the sacristy and don his street garb. Personally, I think it permissible—and even more reverential—to change into civil dress after putting the sacred Host in the pyx and replacing It in the tabernacle, and then, wearing a small stole under the coat, to take the Blessed Sacrament from the tabernacle and bring It to the sick person.

## THE PASTOR'S RIGHT TO GIVE FIRST COMMUNION

*Question:* Is the First Communion of children to be regarded as a strictly parochial function, in such wise that a pastor can insist that the children of his parish participate in this ceremony in the parish church?

*Answer:* It would seem that the solemn First Communion ceremony cannot be regarded as a strictly parochial function, reserved to the pastor—at least, if there is no synodal or conciliar law to this effect. Writing on this subject, Dr. Bernard Kelly says: "While not expressly listed in the common law as a reserved parochial function, nevertheless in some localities the administration of the solemn First Communion of children is an acknowledged parochial prerogative. The practice of having general or solemn First Communions in the parish was recommended by the decree *Quam Singulare*. But whether the solemn Communion can be constituted a reserved parochial function by particular law is not certain" (*The Functions Reserved to Pastors* [The Catholic University of America Press, Washington, D. C., 1947], p. 71).

## BUSINESS CONTACTS WITH DIVORCED PERSONS

*Question 1:* A Catholic employed by a Catholic business man divorces his wife and attempts a new marital union. May his employer retain the man, or is he obliged to dismiss him because of the scandal which might arise from such a situation?

*Question 2:* If a person employed by a firm is preparing to enter a marriage which is patently invalid by Catholic standards—especially if he is a Catholic—may his Catholic fellow-workers be present at the ceremony, or at least contribute toward a gift for the occasion?

*Answer 1:* While Catholics should avoid, as far as possible, social contacts with persons who have contracted new unions after divorce, because of the impression they might give that they regard the status of such persons as equivalent to that of honorably married people (Cf. *AER*, CXVIII, 4 [April, 1948], 306 ff.), it is very evident that purely business associations with such individuals would not create the same impression, and consequently would not be forbidden. Hence, in the happening described by the questioner it would seem that ordinarily the employer could retain the divorced man in his establishment. We say "ordinarily," because there would seem to be an exception in the case of a firm or institution that is distinctively Catholic. It would surely be a source of some scandal if a person who had been divorced and attempted remarriage were retained in a Catholic bookstore, a Catholic hospital, a Catholic school, etc.

*Answer 2:* Undoubtedly the Catholic fellow-workers would do wrong, by furnishing the occasion of scandal, if they attended the wedding or the wedding reception of a Catholic companion, known to be contracting an invalid marital union according to Catholic standards. There might be a little more leniency in the matter of contributing toward a gift for the couple. Perhaps this difficulty could be solved by choosing a distinctively Catholic gift, such as a crucifix or a book on Christian marriage.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

# Analecta

By a decree of June 29, 1950,[1] the Sacred Congregation of the Council declared that they automatically incur a specially reserved excommunication who take any part in a conspiracy against ecclesiastical authorities or in the intrusion into office of anyone not entitled to it in virtue of a canonical right.

On Sept. 3, 1950,[2] our Holy Father delivered a radio message to the International Congress of Jocists assembled in Brussels repeating his expression of gratification, already expressed to them in a letter, that the observance of the twenty-fifth anniversary of their founding should coincide with the Holy Year. He spoke to the representatives of young workers of forty-eight countries (including two lay leaders of the Young Christian Workers of the United States). Our Holy Father adverted to the encouraging spectacle of the results of their activity in the past, the surest guaranty for the re-Christianization of the working class throughout the world, for the response to the zealous labors of the movement had produced in most gratifying numbers not only priests and religious but also thousands of happy families, as well as heads of powerful labor organizations and even of government, trained to view the problems of life in the spirit that is inculcated by the Jocists. He called to their attention, as they look toward the future, the effort of the materialist advocates of the class struggle to infuse into the worker something that until lately had been disregarded, that is, a specific culture, a materialistic culture. He told the delegates that they must be alert to this newest policy and to meet it by activating the religious character of the worker and by feeding the spark of Divinity lying dormant in his innermost being. Only in this way can the worker be placed above vulgar materialism and utilitarianism. A second matter that our Holy Father called to the attention of the delegates was the need of integrating the apostolate to the worker with the general apostolate to modern man at large. There cannot be, he insisted, a classification of souls into categories; there are not two kinds of men: workers and non-workers. The carrying on of the apostolate to the worker need not be separated from the apostolate to the modern man because it is the same cause that alienates worker and non-worker alike from the Church, namely the enfeeblement of bloodless souls emptied of all spiritual and religious life. Our Holy Father expressed his gratification that the delegates had opened their Congress with the consecration of international Jocism to the Immaculate Heart of Mary and he prayed that, through the intercession of the Blessed Virgin, God might continue to bless the movement and its expansion everywhere.

---

[1] *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XLII (1950), 601.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 639.

On Aug. 6, 1950,[3] our Holy Father addressed a letter to the twenty-first International Congress of Pax Romana meeting in Amsterdam. He adverted to the diversity of literary and scientific professions represented by the delegates, as well as to the wealth of the traditions of the various countries they came from. He expressed the gratification he derived from the testimony their attendance gave to the stability of Catholic thought, resting on the service of the Creator, in contrast with the insecurity inherent in the systems based on philosophical relativism. He appealed to them to realize the charity and unity symbolized in their Congress through an ever closer method of strengthening and supporting Catholic students and scholars in their interrelations with each other in the promotion of their common objectives. Above all, they should be alert to put their researches and conclusions at the service of the Church, for it cannot be doubted that theologians depend upon them for priceless assistance in regard to established scientific truth.

On July 9, 1950,[4] our Holy Father canonized St. Anna of Jesus de Paredes and preached a homily on that occasion. The next day[5] he addressed an allocution to the faithful who had come to Rome to witness the ceremonies of her canonization. He glorified her as the national heroine of Ecuador who, in 1645, at the age of twenty-six, gave her life to save her people from earthquake and pestilence. In so doing she proved the intensity of the energy derived from prayer and sacrifice and thus provided the best argument for the present generation, especially of her countrymen, that her virtues are those which they must communicate to their children in order to enable them to contribute to the national welfare benefits that may in some measure be like to those which she bestowed on it.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 635. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 609. [5] *Ibid.*, p. 637.

On June 24, 1950,[6] our Holy Father canonized St. Maria Goretti and preached a homily on that occasion also. The same day[7] he addressed an allocution to the faithful who had come to Rome to witness the ceremonies of her canonization. He told them that their presence in such great numbers proved that the simple story of the martyr of purity had enabled her to capture their hearts and established beyond dispute that in a world apparently immersed in hedonism there are not only the chosen ranks of the ascetics but also vast multitudes for whom the supernatural perfume of Christian purity possesses a reassuring and an irresistible fascination. But though her victory was primarily one of purity, nevertheless in that purity there triumphed also the other Christian virtues of which her purity was an affirmation. For her supreme heroism was the climax of intense preparation during a period in which her soul was made the master of all that is material through her obedient love for her parents, her sacrifices in the performance of daily arduous chores, her poverty made tolerable by her confidence in the Providence of God, her efforts to learn the doctrines of faith in ever more clear detail, her devotion to prayer, and her ardent love of Jesus in the Holy Eucharist. Not to be forgotten is the crowning act of love by which she heroically extended pardon to the man who killed her. A rustic garland, dear to God, of flowers of the field, adorning first her first Communion veil and too soon thereafter the ornament of her martyrdom! He pointed to the scandalous contrast to the martyrdom of St. Maria that is to be found in the numerous sources of attack on purity and he urged young people to resist with all their strength all that would rob them of this great virtue. He exhorted parents, in the presence of the mother who trained a martyr for her supreme heroic act, that they should pledge themselves to shelter their children from the occasions that might prove a source of moral perversion. The allocution closed with a powerful prayer to St. Maria to aid the young and their parents in the avoidance of all moral contagion that they might be worthy to walk the path of life in the serenity and the happiness of the pure of heart.

On July 1, 1950,[8] our Holy Father sent a letter to the Moderator General of the Apostleship of Prayer expressing his gratification with the manifold fruits of the Crusade of Prayer and Pious Works sponsored by the association during the Holy Year.

---

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 579.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 597.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 634.

Another letter, dated June 29, 1950,[9] was sent on the occasion of the golden jubilee of the ordination of His Eminence, Enrique Cardinal Pla y Daniel, Archbishop of Toledo.

The Blessed Virgin, under the title of Madonna del Pontelungo, was made the Patroness of the City and the Diocese of Albenga in virtue of Apostolic Letters dated July 8, 1949.[10]

St. Alphonsus Maria de Liguori was named, by Apostolic Letters dated April 26, 1950,[11] the patron of moralists and confessors; and by similar Letters dated May 15, 1950,[12] St. John Baptist de la Salle was designated the patron of teachers of youth.

St. Gerard Majella was declared, by Apostolic Letters dated Oct. 28, 1949,[13] to be the co-equal patron with St. Cataldus, of the City of Corato in the Archdiocese of Trani.

Four churches were given the rank of minor basilica by Apostolic Letters issued as follows: June 2, 1949,[14] the cathedral of the Diocese of Aguas Calientes, Mexico; Aug. 12, 1949,[15] the cathedral of the Diocese of Mercedes in Argentina; Nov. 11, 1949,[16] the church of St. Mary of Mercy in the town of Jerez in the Archdiocese of Seville; and Nov. 25, 1949,[17] the cathedral of the Diocese of Pozzuoli.

A decree of the Sacred Consistorial Congregation, dated March 7, 1950,[18] transferred the cathedral of the Dioceses of Porto and Santa Rufina from a small church to a larger one built by the Cardinal Bishop.

Six Apostolic Constitutions made adjustments in the territorial subdivisions of the Church as follows: March 3, 1949,[19] a new diocese was established, that of Wenchow, in territory that was previously in the southern part of the Diocese of Ningpo; March 28, 1950,[20] a new diocese was established in the Philippines, that of Lucena, as well as a Prelacy *nullius*, that of Infanta (the latter under date of April 25, 1950[21]), in territory formerly assigned to the Diocese of Lipa; April 18, 1950,[22] the Apostolic Prefecture of Fiume Maddalena in Columbia was raised to the status of an Apostolic Vicariate, that of Barranca Bermeja; April 18, 1950,[23] the Apostolic Prefecture of Hungtung was raised to the status of a diocese; and May 6, 1950,[24] a new diocese to remain united to the Archdiocese of Syracuse was established at Ragusa in territory taken from the Archdiocese.

---

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 632.

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 591.

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 595.

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 631.

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 626.

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 590.

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 593.

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 627.

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 629.

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 600.

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 613.

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 583.

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 587.

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 586.

[23] *Ibid.*, p. 620.

The establishment of a hierarchy in British West Africa was effected by an Apostolic Constitution dated April 18, 1950.[25]

A decree of the Sacred Consistorial Congregation, dated March 19, 1950,[26] settled a boundary difficulty by assigning one of the two towns in dispute to the Diocese of Velletri and the other to the Diocese of Terracina.

Five decrees of the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith were concerned with territorial rearrangements as follows: Feb. 2, 1950,[27] the name of the Apostolic Vicariate of Liberia was changed to that of Monrovia; the decree of March 10, 1950,[28] transferred an eastern portion of the Apostolic Vicariate of Windhoek in British East Africa to the Apostolic Vicariate of Livingston; that of April 18, 1950,[29] changed the names of four Apostolic Prefectures in British West Africa; another of the same date[30] transferred to the native clergy the Apostolic Vicariate of Hanoi in Indonesia; and a decree of May 24, 1950,[31] assigned to the Apostolic Vicariate of Leopoldville in the Belgian Congo limited portions of the Apostolic Vicariates of Koango, Kisantu, and Coquilhatville.

Among the names of bishops given appointments by the Sacred Consistorial Congregation one finds the following names: July 18, 1950: Most Rev. Francis P. Leipzig, D.D., Bishop of Baker City; Most Rev. Thomas F. Markham, D.D., Titular of Acalisso and Auxiliary of Boston; Most Rev. Leo A. Pursley, D.D., Titular of Adrianopolis in Pisidia and Auxiliary of Fort Wayne; Aug. 24, 1950; Most Rev. Merlin J. Guilfoyle, D.D., Titular of Bulla and Auxiliary of San Francisco.

### RECENT PONTIFICAL APPOINTMENTS ANNOUNCED IN THE ACTA APOSTOLICAE SEDIS

*Domestic Prelates of His Holiness:*

July 16, 1948: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Louis A. Wolf, of the Diocese of Cleveland.

---

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 622.

[25] *Ibid.*, p. 615.

[26] *Ibid.*, p. 643.

[27] *Ibid.*, p. 603.

[28] *Ibid.*, p. 646.

[29] *Ibid.*, p. 647.

[30] *Ibid.*, p. 647.

[31] *Ibid.*, p. 648.

[32] *Ibid.*, p. 644.

May 30, 1949: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Howard J. Teare, of the Diocese of Cleveland.

*Privy Chamberlains Supernumerary of His Holiness:*

Dec. 20, 1949: Very Rev. Msgr. Thomas J. McCarthy, of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles.

Dec. 22, 1949: Very Rev. Msgrs. Leo Roy Aycock, of the Diocese of Alexandria; Clarence Nicholas Biever, Leo Sylvester Feuerbach, William Patrick Leahy, and William H. McGuill, of the Diocese of Rapid City; and Lawrence E. Gaynor and Eugene Geary, of the Diocese of El Paso.

March 5, 1950: Very Rev. Msgr. William Greene, of the Archdiocese of New York.

March 31, 1950: Very Rev. Msgrs. Ralph A. Asplan and Conrad H. Boffa, of the Archdiocese of Cincinnati.

Apr. 6, 1950: Very Rev. Msgrs. Bernard J. McLaughlin, James J. Navagh, and Joseph E. Schieder, of the Diocese of Buffalo.

Apr. 23, 1950: Very Rev. Msgrs. Francis P. Barilla and Vincent O. Genova, of the Diocese of Brooklyn.

JEROME D. HANNON

*The Catholic University of America*
*Washington, D. C.*

### THE HOLY FATHER TO THE CARDINALS AND BISHOPS

We must speak, though with deep anguish of soul, about something that comes, not from any evil present within the Church, but which is imposed by force and violence from the outside. Alas, there are absent from your ranks and from the pious multitudes of the faithful the Catholics from those regions where they have been refused the freedom of joining themselves peacefully with their brethren professing the same faith in Rome, the beloved and affectionate Mother and the Capital of the Christian world. O most beloved sons, sadly deprived of your sacred rights of freedom, we have never forgotten you. You are never absent from our hearts. Indeed, if it were lawful for us to set degrees to our charity for the sheep of Christ, you would have the first place in the order of our love.

—Pope Pius XII, speaking in his allocution *Penitus commoto animo* delivered on Nov. 2, 1950.

# Book Reviews

CHRIST THE SAVIOUR. A Commentary on the Third Part of St. Thomas' Theological Summa. By Reginald Garrigou-Lagrange, O.P. Translated by Dom Bede Rose, O.S.B. St. Louis and London: B. Herder Book Co., 1950. Pp. IV + 748. $9.00.

Since 1937, Fr. Garrigou-Lagrange has been working on the publication of a series of commentaries on the *Summa*. Six volumes have appeared to date. Dom Bede Rose has already given us an English translation of the treatise *De Deo Uno*. Now, thanks again to his labors, we may likewise read in English the *De Christo Salvatore*, a commentary on the first fifty-nine questions of the Third Part of the *Summa*.

There are two parts: the Incarnation, the Redemption. The first part is considerably the longer, since it lends itself more readily to speculative developments. The whole constitutes a commentary on the *Summa* with the very text of St. Thomas as a basis. Article by article it is summarized and set forth, soberly explained by recourse to texts of other words of the Angelic Doctor. All the questions which have been raised by the text of St. Thomas are treated by the author and resolved in conformity with the doctrine of the Thomistic school. Those which modern theologians have especially studied are underscored. The nature of the hypostatic union covers ninety pages; capital grace, thirty. At the end, there is a Compendium of Mariology in twenty pages along with an appendix on the definability of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin.

This volume is situated in the line of great commentaries on the *Summa* drawn up by Cajetan, John of St. Thomas, the Salmanticenses, Gonet and Billuart, but with greater insistence on the positive bases. And if the author refers to specialists for a more profound understanding of the Fathers and the genesis of their doctrines, if we sometimes feel it necessary to remake after him the critique of the interpretation which he proposes of the thought of non-scholastic and even of non-Thomist authors, he nevertheless possesses a very keen and true sense of the degree of authority warranted by the various theses he sustains; and it would not be prudent to underestimate the testimony which he presents on the actual state of doctrinal tradition.

The first reflection which this work inspires bears on the pedagogical value of St. Thomas. It is indeed deplorable that so few seminaries and faculties of theology have been able to execute the will of the popes to give the *Summa* as a text to students in theology. Fr. Garrigou-

Lagrange will perhaps dispel the prejudices. We shall see how all the light contributed by history and science, all the new questions awakened by the evolution of culture, easily find their places in a good commentary. By comparing the truncations and juxtapositions of manuals —even modern—with the organic manner in which thought advances in the *Summa,* we shall readily see that order and true sciences are not opposed to life; and we shall, perhaps, return to the "Guide of Studies."

Among Garrigou-Lagrange's treatises, his teaching on the Incarnation is perhaps the newest and most valuable commentary, the one most ordained toward the spiritual life. Let us underline two points. First of all, a significant article precedes the exposition of different systems explaining the mode of the hypostatic union; it is entitled: "Introduction or ascent toward a certain understanding of the Incarnation." The comparison between "Ontological Ecstasy"—which is the assumption by the Person of the Word of a human nature totally deprived of its own personality—and the moral plan of "self-abnegation," a comparison so well employed by Chardon and Cardinal de Berulle, throws new light on the mystical life of Christ, the Supreme Model of all mystical life (pp. 131-38).

Another Chapter (XXXV) introduces the mystery of the Redemption: "The sublime mystery of Redemption inasmuch as it is a mystery of love." It clearly shows how love is, in reality, the only true price, the only true satisfaction God asks from man and which is offered to God in our name through Jesus Christ. With this as a foundation, there follows the co-ordination of the four complementary ideas of merit, satisfaction, sacrifice, redemption. The timeliness of the Appendix on the definability of the doctrine of the Assumption is obvious in this year of the definition.

The English translation omits the bibliography, very limited in any case, of the Latin edition; on the other hand, it gives us a greatly improved alphabetical index. Another advantage to be found in the elegant English translation: literary imperfections and even negligence of the lecture-style Latin are no longer evident. A little error special to the English translation (p. 77) has placed the denial of the soul of Christ among the heresies relative to the divinity of Christ.

In brief, Dom Bede Rose has placed in the hands of theological professors and their students a magnificent tool. Let us hope that he will be able to make known in an English translation the other commentaries where the great Dominican theologian—at once so metaphysical and so spiritual—puts within everyone's reach the fruits of a long and magisterial teaching career.

GERARD YELLE, S.S.

APOSTOLATE OF THE SUNDAY MASS. By E. C. Messenger, Ph.D. Westminster, Maryland: Newman Press, 1947-1950. Vols. 4. $11.00

"This is a series of little books in which I have endeavored to show what a wealth of material for a spiritual life is to be found in the Proper of the Sunday Mass throughout the year." This is the opening sentence of the author's preface. It is the opinion of this reviewer that Dr. Messenger has succeeded in attaining his goal.

So far there are four volumes in the series: the first *The Sunday Introits and Graduals;* the second, *The Sunday Collects;* the third, *The Sunday Epistles;* the fourth, *The Sunday Gospels.* In each of the volumes he does three things and does them remarkably well. First, he gives the background without which the Introits and Graduals, the Collects, the Epistles and Gospels would not be fully intelligible. He explains each passage in its particular context. In so doing he lifts, as it were, the blinds and lets in the light that will enable one to see clearly the beautiful paintings of Christian Revelation. Secondly, with the skill of a master who has spent a lifetime studying the painted canvas of God's Word, he reveals to us its hidden beauties, its theological implications. And he does this with a charming simplicity which makes his books very readable. Thirdly, he shows how to reflect in one's daily life the beauty which one has contemplated. His application of the Scriptures to modern everyday life and its problems is very deftly done. However, he fails to make any tie up between the Proper of the Mass and the Sacrifice itself. Because of this many liturgical implications are missed.

The work is a popular presentation by an outstanding scholar. It has depth of thought but with clarity of expression. It can be read with great profit by the average Catholic. Here then is a set of books which priests should strongly urge the faithful to read. For there is no better spiritual reading than the Word of God explained and applied to modern living.

Study of these volumes will profit the priest himself in two ways: first, it will furnish him with rich material for meditation; second, it will provide him with sound doctrine and stimulating ideas for his Sunday sermons. The priest who makes use of these books will improve his spiritual life and will preach better sermons.

LUKE MISSETT, C.P.

IÑIGO DE LOYOLA. By Pedro Leturia, S.J. Translated by Aloysius Owen, S.J. Syracuse: Le Moyne College Press, 1949. Pp. xiii, 209.

This biography of St. Ignatius Loyola merely comprises the events which elapsed between the birth of the saint and the time when he discarded his sword of knighthood to consecrate himself completely to God at Manresa. Its distinguishing marks are: careful attention to the sources, historical impartiality, and especially a critical study of the background of the saint's life. The purpose of the author is to trace the influences of time, place, and custom which prepared the saint for his conversion and to give a full, well-documented account of the process which culminated in that momentous event. In this endeavor Leturia has succeeded admirably. Spain and the Basque country, France and the international world, come to life beneath his pen. Amid this environment we see Ignatius, ambitious, magnanimous, chivalrous, full of sturdy faith and yet not without moral laxness, striding to the destiny set for him by Divine Providence. The author is not a panegyrist but a scientifically trained historian who paints the lights and shadows of his theme with objective fidelity and literary artistry.

The first chapter is particularly interesting; for it delineates the various characteristics of the Basque nation and country which left their lasting impress on the saint. The remaining chapters recount the facts usually found in other lives of the saint but with unequalled wealth of detail, psychological insight, and interpretative skill.

The book concludes with three appendices. The first contains quotations, chiefly from poets, contemporaneous with Ignatius to which the author alludes in the course of his biography; the second is a biographical index of sources; the third is an index of names and places. In addition, there is a frontispiece, a photograph of the saint taken from the death mask. The translation from the Spanish original has been done with unusual skill. The book, then, represents a notable contribution to the early life of St. Ignatius.

MICHAEL J. GRUENTHANER, S.J.

CATHERINE MCAULEY, THE FIRST SISTER OF MERCY. By Roland Burke Savage, S.J., A.M. Dublin: M. H. Gill and Son Ltd., 1949. Pp. xii + 434. 15/.

This is the inspiring account of an eighteenth-century Irish girl whose work goes on throughout the world a hundred years after her death. Catherine McAuley was born near Dublin on Sept. 29, 1781, the daughter of a prosperous building contractor, James McGauley—there were variations within the family in spelling the name—and his young wife, Elinor Conway. When only two years old, Catherine lost her father; when she was seventeen, her mother died. After her mother's death, she went to live with a Catholic uncle, Owen Conway, while her brother James and her sister Mary went to Protestant relatives who raised them as Protestants. Catherine was more fortunate as far as her faith was concerned, but less so in a material way, at least at first. Within a short time her uncle was reduced to penury and in 1803 Catherine went to live with non-Catholic friends, Mr. and Mrs. William Callaghan, at Coolock House near Dublin. Her steadfast adherence to her faith, strength of character, and charm of personality made a deep impression on the Callaghans and both of them received the grace of conversion to the Church on their deathbeds. On William Callaghan's death in November, 1822, it was found that Catherine McAuley had been left the sum of £25,000. In terms of current American dollars this would amount to well over $1,000,000.

The story of what Catherine McAuley did, not merely with this bequest, but with her gifts of grace and nature, is told by Fr. Savage in succeeding chapters of his book. It is a tremendous story. Today the Sisters of Mercy carry on their work in Ireland and in England, Scotland, Wales, the Channel Islands, and the Isle of Man; in the United States and Newfoundland; in Central America and the West Indies; in South America; in South Africa; in Australia and in New Zealand. In the United States alone they conduct colleges, academies, high schools, business and elementary schools; catechetical schools and vacation schools in Christian doctrine; homes for the aged; residences for working girls and business women; day nurseries, child welfare centers, and orphanages; hospitals, and sanatoriums, including a leprosarium and homes for mental cases; summer camps and rest homes, and other institutions. They work without distinction among Negroes, Indians, and whites.

Where else in modern times, except in the case of other holy women within the Church, can a story of such service to the human race be found? All that this great woman did before her death on Nov. 11, 1841, and all that her nuns have accomplished in the past and at present and will accomplish in the future, can only be guessed at. The record of such a life and character should be required reading not only in religious houses but as well in schools of social work and in colleges and universities. It holds a lesson for any age, but especially for an age such as our own. While our world rejects God and plunges ever deeper into disaster, we will do well to read of what this great woman did by following her confessor's counsel, "Do not place your trust in any man but in God alone."

JOHN K. RYAN

VESSEL OF CLAY. By Leo Trese. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1950. Pp. 115. $2.00.

It is a pleasure to recommend very highly to the clerical brethren this volume of *practical* meditations in the form of reveries on the priest's life and duties from 6:30 in the morning until 11:30 at night. It touches all the aspects of pastoral ministry and has no page which does not reflect both priestly experience and a thoughtful priestly mind. It is quite free of the emptiness that can so easily characterize books in this category and there is no priest who could not profit by a serious consideration of the facts brought before him here.

Perhaps the keynote of this whole examination of the priestly life is given by the very graceful dedication: "To the 'Little People' of Christ's Church: The Laity whose love and reverence for their priests make us so often ashamed of falling so far short of their just expectations."

Everything that is said invites to a delicate consideration of the priest's duty to remember his obligation to his people. Perhaps it will not be presumptuous to recommend this book very specially to priests who are giving priests' retreats. One of the serious and prevalent faults to be found in this department is the failure to come to grips with the real moral problems of a priest's life. This book is full of suggestions that would remedy this fault. I do not know whether the author has ever given priests' retreats or whether he would be grateful for the suggestion that he would be an admirable candidate for fulfilling such an office.

In any case he has rendered a real service to the priesthood by putting together this admirable little volume.

Msgr. John K. Cartwright

Catholic Library Practice. Edited by Brother David Martin C.S.C. Vol. II. Portland: University of Portland Press, 1950. Pp. viii+276. $3.75.

This second in the *University of Portland Miscellaneous Publications* covers, frequently as the only source of information on the subject, fifteen areas of interest to Catholic librarians and readers of any persuasion or profession. The range of interest is wide and the range of usefulness is far-reaching. Catholic newspapers, periodicals, and pamphlets; school, college, pastors' and convent libraries; Catholic reference works, public relations, bibliotherapy and the uses of microphotography; illustrators and authors of children's books—all find their place and incisive treatment in this extraordinarily rich and informative collection.

The heterogenous nature of these essays reflects the pervasive influence of books and reading in the spiritual and intellectual life of Catholics. Any apparent omissions will generally be found to have been discussed in the first volume of *Catholic Library Practice.* The emphasis is practical rather than theoretical and looks to the possibility of